


THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY



VOLUME TWO

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS IN THE SECOND EDITION OF VOLUME I

I. NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE EARLY SUMERO-BABYLONIAN PERIOD

PROFESSOR LANGDON has recently published an important inscription, part of the Weld-Blundell collection¹ in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. It is a large prism with eight columns of closely-written chronological material which gives the entire Sumerian lists of dynasties before and after the Flood to the end of the Isin dynasty in 2076 B.C. A small tablet in the same collection contains the names of the ten kings who reigned before the Flood, for which period it gives 456,000 years. The dynastic prism has only eight kings before the Flood and assigns to them a duration of 241,200 years. Other important dynastic lists in fragmentary condition have been found in the Nippur Collection. These agree with the Oxford prism in giving twenty dynasties from the Flood to the Isin dynasty inclusive, and 125 kings.

The first dynasty reigned at Kish (p. 365, l. 18 from end). It included 23 kings, who are said to have reigned 24,510 years, 3 months and $3\frac{1}{2}$ days. The figure recalls the 'World-year' of 25,920 years, the approximate period of the sun's apparent revolution through the twelve signs of the zodiac; but it is unlikely that the precession of the equinoxes was known even in the age of the most advanced Babylonian astronomical knowledge (Langdon, *op. cit.* p. 3, n. 6, cf. Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sternendienst in Babel*, II, 24-32). The longest and shortest reigns of this dynasty are 1500 and 140 years respectively; the names differ somewhat from the list on p. 665, and the name of Zūakipu (the 'scorpion') is replaced by Daggagib. The first dynasty of Erech (p. 366) counted twelve kings, reigning 2310 years. The name of the second king of the dynasty of Ur (p. 367, l. 19) may preferably be read Meskem-Nannar. The dynasty of Awan (the identification with Awak should be omitted on pp. 366, l. 21 *sq.*, 438, l. 14 from end) had three kings ruling 356 years.

The details on p. 367 (lower half of the page) are considerably affected by the new prism. A list of *seven* kingdoms now intervenes between the semi-historic period and the northern Semitic kingdom of Akshak. The second dynasty at Kish, which succeeded that at Awan, may be placed about 3700 B.C.; to its eight kings the prism assigns 3195 years. The next dynasty ruled at Khamazi and its king Khadanish is said to have ruled 360 or 420 years, the figures are presumably errors for six or seven years. The sovereignty then returns to Erech in the south (c. 3400 B.C.), where the name of only one king, Enugduanna, is known. It is probable that the names of Lugalkigubnilakh and Lugalkisalsi are to be inserted here. After this second kingdom of Erech we reach the second kingdom of Ur, where four kings ruled 108 years. The capital now shifts to Adab for a period of 90 years, and then far to the north at Maer, where a dynasty of six kings (Ansir, [Lugaltar]zi, the rest are mutilated) reigned 136 years. It seems evident from the texts that the two succeeding kingdoms of Kish (the third) and Akshak were contemporary.

If, therefore, we may follow the new source, it may be computed that these dynasties were founded about 2967-6 B.C., in which case the first approximately fixed date in Sumerio-Babylonian history will have to be placed more than 200 years lower than that given on p. 367, l. 4 from end.

Moreover, it would now seem that the old third dynasty of Kish disappears (see p. 667 [8], and n. 4); the two kings Urzaged and Lugal-tarsi belong to the second dynasty of Erech, and Mesilim possibly to the Awan dynasty (Langdon, *op. cit.* p. 6 *sq.*). The first kings of Kish of whom we have contemporary records apparently belonged to other kingdoms, and claim the title because of its dignity. On p. 393, l. 9 *sq.* read: who followed the second kingdom at Kish and the brief dynasty of Khamazi (c. 3400).

The *third* (not *fourth*) dynasty of Kish was founded by Kug-Bau, as the name should now be read instead of Azag-Bau (p. 370 last par., and l. 7 from end).

¹ *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, II. *The Weld-Blundell collections*, vol. II. *Historical inscriptions, containing principally the chronological prism*, W-B 444. Oxford, 1923.

Ur-Nina was contemporary with the rulers of Maer, not Akshak (p. 379, l. 14 from end). On p. 380, ll. 9-11, omit the words: convincing evidence...dynasty, and *ib.* l. 6 from end, for Uruazagga the better reading now is Uru-kugga.

Rimush (p. 408, l. 19 from end), according to the Oxford prism, reigned *nine* years. Manishtusu was his *elder brother* (p. 409, l. 21 *sq.*). Naram-Sin was his *son* (contrast *ib.*), although Babylonian tradition calls him son of Sargon (p. 412 foot)¹. For 22 read 24 (*ib.* last line); and note that the prism gives a much lower figure for his reign—probably 38 years (p. 413, l. 6).

The fifth dynasty of Erech contains only one king, Utukhegal, to whom is ascribed a reign of 7 years, 2 months and 7 days (p. 434, last par.). To Dungi (p. 437, l. 6) is ascribed a reign of 47 (not 58) years, and Langdon reduces all the figures in his reign (ll. 4-18, and also p. 456, l. 21 from end) by eleven. The length of the reign of Bur-Sin (p. 457, l. 20) is given as *nine* (not *eight*) years.

Finally, on the basis of the Oxford prism and other evidence Langdon arrives at dates generally lower than those adopted in this volume. Starting from Kugler's brilliant interpretation of the tablet of observations of the planet Venus for the twenty-one years of the reign of Ammi-zaduga, the tenth king of the First Babylonian Dynasty, and in consultation with the Oxford astronomer, Dr Fotheringham, he now holds that the beginning of this dynasty may be placed at 2169 B.C. The astronomical calculations in themselves are not entirely final, and the argument also turns upon the precise beginning of the year in certain contracts relating to the division of the date-harvest and the renting of fields in the seventh-eighth months. The date which Langdon now adopts is fifty-six years lower than that adopted in this volume (pp. 404, l. 3, 479, 673), but he definitely rejects the much lower dates for the dynasty which are held by Weidner (*viz.* 2057, see p. 672, n. 1) and Kugler (*viz.* 2049).

Langdon maintains the date 2357 for the beginning of the dynasty of Isin (pp. 471, 672); but, besides the modification of the earliest approximately fixed date (*viz.* 2967-6, see above), other important changes are suggested arising out of the Oxford prism. Thus, the Maer-Akshak-Kish domination (p. 371, l. 14) may be dated 3103-2777. For the Kug-Bau dynasty (*ib.* l. 7) he suggests 2967-2873, and a similar reduction of about 120 years becomes necessary on p. 378, l. 12 (*viz.* 2967-2873). So the date of Sargon becomes 2752 (pp. 368, l. 16 from end, 403, l. 8). Lugal-zaggisi begins to reign in 2777 (pp. 395, l. 21, 402, l. 2). The fourth dynasty of Erech is dated 2571-2542 (p. 423, l. 9), and that of Gutium becomes 2541-2416 (pp. 423 *sq.*, 670). Ur-Bau's date is 2620 (p. 373, l. 26). The end of the last dynasty of Ur is fixed at 2328 (p. 377, l. 13), and Dungi and Bursin are dated respectively 2391 and 2345 B.C. (pp. 437, l. 5, 457, l. 19).

These dates indicate the complexity of the chronological problems, and the difficulty of obtaining conclusive results, owing to the serious differences among the ancient sources themselves and the frequently very intricate character of the astronomical and other questions. They are not to be regarded as final, but it seemed desirable that a general statement of the evidence published by Prof. Langdon should be made accessible in this edition.

¹ Prof. Langdon adds that Sargon claims to have collected ships from Melukkhha, Magan and Dilmun at the quay of Agade (addition to p. 404, l. 14).

II. NOTE ON KASSITE NAMES

The following is a translation of the Babylonian renderings of the names of the twenty-one kings, chiefly Kassites, mentioned on p. 553 of volume 1:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| "Wide-spread kin" | "Man of Gula" |
| "True kin" | "Man of Shukamuna" |
| "Shepherd of the Kashshi" | "Man of Shimalia" |
| "Offspring of Marduk" | "Man of Shamash" |
| "Offspring of the Lord of lands" | "Protect(ion)" |
| "Shadow of Ninurta" | "Protect(ion) of [Shamash]" |
| "Man of Marduk" | "Protect(ion) of the Lord of lands" |
| "Servant of the [Lord of land]s" (?) | "Hel[p of the Lord of lands]" |
| "Help of Bel" | "Hel[p of Shamash]" |
| "Offspring of Bel" | "[Shadow of Marduk]" |
| | "[Shadow of the Lord] of lands" |

LIST OF THE MORE IMPORTANT CORRECTIONS MADE IN THE SECOND EDITION OF VOLUME I

- p. 7, l. 15. *For* tiled *read* tiltu
- p. 22, l. 19 from end. *Read* are adaptations we should expect if for ages this milk etc.
- p. 39, last line. *Read* Shatt el-Arab
- p. 86, l. 9 from end. *Add* See also p. 579.
- p. 96, l. 24. *Read* The 'giants' graves' of Sardinia show development from simpler types to the phase when etc.
- p. 131, l. 17. *For* Enno Littman *read* H. C. Butler of Princeton
- p. 135, l. 9 from end. *For* Lau- *read* Law-
- p. 135, last line. *Add a reference to* vol. II, chap. XI.
- p. 136, l. 8 from end. *For* much *read* part
- p. 137, ll. 24 *sq.* *Read* discoveries. In the later years of his life he resumed, with the collaboration of Dörpfeld, patient work at Troy. He had just found the sixth or Homeric city when, at the end of 1890, he died suddenly at Naples.
- p. 138, l. 7. *Add* Schliemann himself looked towards Crete.
- p. 139, l. 3 *sq.* *For* literally degenerate *read* conventionalized
- p. 139, l. 9 *sq.* *For* Gournia under Miss Harriet Boyd (afterwards Mrs Hawes) *read* in Crete by Miss Harriet Boyd (Mrs Hawes) and by Seager
- p. 139, l. 16, and l. 10 from end. *For* pre-Hellenic *read* pre-classical
- p. 139, l. 21 *sq.* *Read* in the Cyclades, the scene of Tsountas' patient and fruitful researches, Phylakopi in Melos (the centre of the obsidian trade), excavated by the British School at Athens; and the French and German excavations of Thera.
- p. 139, l. 18 from end. *Read* we may refer to Tsountas' long campaigns at Mycenae and brilliant success at Vaphio; Dörpfeld's etc.
- p. 139, l. 13 from end. *For* in Chaeronea *read* around Chaeronea
- p. 139, l. 9 from end. *Before* in Thessaly *prefix* and of Wace and Thompson
- p. 141, l. 6. *For* degenerated into *read* was stereotyped in
- p. 142, l. 10 from end. *After* Argolis *add* and Boeotia
- p. 152, l. 1. *For* i, 95 *read* i, 96
- p. 166, l. 3. *For* 1225 *read* 1025
- p. 168, l. 22. *For* Menpehre *read* Menpeh(ti)re
- p. 168, l. 9 from end. *For* first *read* sixteenth
- p. 168, l. 7 from end. *For* 1876 or 1872 *read* 1882 (1876) or 1876 (1872) B.C.
- p. 170, l. 4. *For* new-moon *read* new year
- p. 172, l. 16 from end. *Read* Sothic year
- p. 174, l. 4 from end. *After* African and Anatolian sources *add* or possibly the Dodecanese
- p. 175, l. 6 from end. *For* of the XIIIth Dynasty *read* (? of the XVIIth cent. B.C.)
- p. 176, ll. 8 and 6 from end. *For* Tiî *read* Tiî
- p. 238, l. 7. *For* twentieth *read* nineteenth
- p. 266, l. 31. *For* Hsekiu *read* Seka
- p. 272, l. 2 from end. *For* 'the coffined one,' *read* an ancient deity
- p. 276, l. 18 from end. *For* 27 *read* 29.
- p. 282, l. 16. *For* Kkufu *read* Khufu
- p. 286, l. 12 from end. *For* blocks throughout *read* and limestone blocks
- p. 287, l. 16. *For* 'Great Seer' *read* 'Chief of the Seers'
- p. 288, l. 16 from end. *For* an almost contemporary copy on papyrus *read* a papyrus copy of the Middle Kingdom *See below* on p. 657.
- p. 291, last line of text. *For* probably somewhat *read* some centuries
- p. 314, l. 15. *For* Aahhotep *read* Iahhotep (also on p. 314, ll. 23, 25), and for Kamose *read* Namases
- p. 314, ll. 16, 25. *For* Ahmose (Aahmes) *read* Iahmases (Amosis or Ahmose)
- p. 314, l. 26. *For* (Thutmose, etc.) *read* (Thutmases, Thutmose or Tethmosis)

- p. 315, l. 8. *For Ahmose (Amosis) read Amosis (Iahmases)*
- p. 315, ll. 14, 17, 26. *For Ahmose read Amosis*
- p. 323, l. 10 from end. *For Middle read Old*
- p. 323, lines 3-2 from end. *Read His enmity to Horus and to Osiris, of whom he was traditionally the murderer, was now emphasized; he was proscribed.*
- p. 353, l. 3. *For uncle read brother*
- p. 360, l. 1. *For (site uncertain) read (see p. 688, n. 1)*
- p. 370, l. 7 from end. *For Azag-Bau read everywhere Kug-Bau*
- p. 380, l. 6 from end. *After Uruazagga add or better Urukugga*
- p. 384, l. 22. *For grains read grams*
- p. 393, l. 19. *On the site of Isin see p. 688 n.*
- p. 393, last line; p. 394, first line. *Tell el-Bandar is incorrect, Prof. Langdon states that the name given to the place is Inghara.*
- p. 398, l. 23. *For seven miles south-west read twelve miles south-south-west*
- p. 399, l. 20 from end. *For Six miles south-west read Ten to twelve miles south-west*
- p. 404, l. 14. *Add He claims to have collected ships from Melukkhka, Magan and Dilmun at the quay of Agade.*
- p. 425, l. 15. *For Uru-azag read Uru-kug; also in the Index, p. 702.*
- p. 430, l. 2. *For or read of*
- p. 435, footnote. *Add Now to be read Ur-Nammu.*
- p. 535, l. 9. *For Marduk read Nabu*
- p. 563, l. 17. *Read Nebuchadrezzar I*
- p. 572, l. 11 from end. *Read The most ancient iron weapon from Egypt is a halbert of 1200 B.C., though an iron spearhead of as early as 2000 B.C. (?) comes from Nubia.*
- p. 572, l. 4 from end. *For Pyramid Texts read inscriptions*
- p. 574, l. 2 from end. *For now read formerly*
- p. 575, l. 9. *For internment read internments*
- p. 579, l. 9 from end. *For impossible read improbable*
- p. 579, l. 7 from end. *For fifth-fourth read fifth*
- p. 579, l. 6 from end. *For probably later read probably much later*
- p. 579, l. 4 from end. *Add See also p. 26.*
- p. 583, ll. 16-17 from end. *For coarse white limestone, or coral rag read coarse-grained whitish gypsum-rock*
- p. 583, l. 13 from end. *For limestone cliffs, read gypsum ridge*
- p. 584, l. 3 sq. *For in the age etc. read well before the age of Ur-Nina. To this earlier time, when sculpture in the round began, belong the archaic figures from el-Obeid and from Adab (Bismaya). Relief sculpture began about the same period. Later on we have etc.*
- p. 585, l. 15 from end. *For date roughly from read are earlier than*
- p. 588, l. 16. *For were possibly not yet read had probably not long been*
- p. 589, l. 12. *For central Greece and Corinth, Thessaly etc. read central and southern Greece, Thessaly etc.*
- p. 599, l. 9 sq. *For Giouchtas read Juktas*
- p. 604, l. 13 sq. from end. *Add as footnote See now p. 603 note.*
- p. 632, l. 22. *For Lidzharski read Lidzbarski*
- p. 657. *Read in the first column at date 2900 (The Proverbs of Ptah-hotep, according to a Middle Kingdom papyrus; see pp. 288, 348) Note correction above, on p. 288.*
- p. 676. *Read Aahmes (Ahmose, Amosis, Iahmases), 170, 311, 314 sq., date 660*
- p. 688. *Read Ilbaba (for Zamama), 372, 394, 446, 489*
- p. 689. *For Kamose read Kamase*
- p. 690. *Read Khaneferre (Kh'a-nfr-Ré')*
- p. 697. *Under S. Omit The Babylonian sh becomes s in Assyrian.*
- p. 702. *Under U. For damma read damma*
- p. 704. *For Zamama read Ilbaba (q.v.)*

PREFACE

IN volume I the history of the Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations was brought down to the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C., and in both cases the story ended in a dark and disturbed period. We left Egypt occupied by the Hyksos and Babylonia by the Kassites. Obscure as the early centuries of the second millennium are, enough is known of the Hyksos and Kassite episodes and of still obscurer vicissitudes in the Levant to warn us that some important movements which we cannot yet clearly trace were then progressing. With the sixteenth century we enter upon a period which is more highly illuminated, and which in some sense has always been familiar ground. The six centuries included in the present volume cover events well-known from the Old Testament (the "exodus" and conquests of the Israelites, and the rise of their monarchy) and from classical tradition (the thalassocracy of Minos, the Trojan War, the Dorian invasions).

But these traditions have now a very different aspect from that which they bore for historians of antiquity sixty years ago who attempted to interpret them and restore the historical setting. The archaeological discoveries that have been made since then furnish a new background which had hardly been suspected, and disclose a multitude of new facts derived from one of the best kinds of historical sources, contemporary official documents. The discovery of the "Amarna letters" in 1887 was followed about twenty years later by the discovery of the archives of the old Hittite Empire at its capital, Boghaz Keui. The power and extent of the Hittite Empire is the most conspicuous fact in the history of the second millennium that has emerged from the research of the last half century. This Empire, of which Rawlinson did not suspect the existence, has now taken an important place in the list of the great Oriental Monarchies.

We know little enough about the Hittites yet, but we are able to form a definite idea of their political importance, and we know that we shall presently know much more. Relatively few of the thousands of Boghaz Keui documents have yet been published, but so unexpected has been their contribution to the history of this mysterious people that what may ultimately be found lies beyond the limit of speculation. Time must elapse before the harvest of the Hittite archives can be fully gathered in and the chaff separated from the wheat; new texts have to be

properly edited, and it often requires the co-operation of experts in different fields before their true significance can be safely determined. It would be hazardous and inexpedient to register here every new preliminary announcement before there has been an opportunity of checking it, and experience suggests that it is safer to say too little than what may afterwards prove to have been too much. It is well to remember that the classical edition of the Amarna letters by the Danish scholar, the late Dr J. A. Knudtzon (with the co-operation of well-known German Assyriologists), was not completed until 1915, and that since then a few more of the same collection, some of importance, have been published¹.

Discoveries which appeal most vividly to the eye and the imagination are not always those which contribute most to the reconstruction of ancient history. While the eyes of the world have been fixed on the excavations at Luxor, the achievement of the late Lord Carnarvon and Mr Howard Carter, so important for our knowledge of Egyptian art, other discoveries have been made, from Mesopotamia to the shores of the Mediterranean, which are more important for our knowledge of ancient history in its wider aspects. The archaeological and documentary material has been steadily, and in later years rapidly, accumulating; but there are still many dark places, many unresolved problems, and many sharp conflicts of opinion. The chronological questions, though not so large and serious as those which met us in volume 1, are such as to preclude complete unanimity. Divergent spellings and transliterations of hieroglyphic and cuneiform names still cause many difficulties. Many places are of uncertain identification and are often differently located by different authorities. Inconsistencies, in a work of collaboration like this, are unavoidable, and the reader should understand that they are typical of the lack of finality incidental to the nature of the evidence and its interpretation. He should realize, for instance, that so outstanding a figure as Ikhnaton can be viewed from different angles, that on the problems of Philistines, Dorians, Ionians, there is no entire agreement of opinion, that the value of the biblical narratives for this period, and that of the Homeric poems can be very variously appraised. The aim has been to present the facts as they appear to the several contributors, and the Editors have deliberately refrained from the effort to make the work represent any one particular school or tendency.

¹ Unfortunately they appeared after chapter XIII was in type and could not be fully utilized (see pp. 313, 315). The same has to be said also of the archaeological discoveries at Byblus, Beth-shean, and elsewhere.

But in spite of all the uncertainties we have now an impressive body of ascertained fact, a solid structure of knowledge; a general agreement has been reached over certain broad questions and also in regard to the spirit and method of enquiry. The discoveries of the last hundred, and especially—we may perhaps say—the last forty, years have wrought a revolution and replaced once and for all an old long-familiar picture by a new one, and one which, so far as all indications suggest, will only be filled out and corrected by future research, not replaced by yet another.

During the period surveyed in this volume peoples of south-western Asia, Egypt and south-eastern Europe were brought into close contact. Asia Minor, as the bridge between Asia and Europe, now assumes a particular importance on this account, as well as on account of the Hittites and the problems which their state raises. The volume therefore opens with two chapters on the peoples of Asia Minor and of Europe by Dr Giles, designed to introduce the reader to the general ethnical and linguistic facts.

Egypt is again, as in vol. i, the country whose history is most fully known to us. Dr James Breasted, in six chapters, relates the internal and external events, and Professor Peet (chapter ix), continuing (from vol. i, chapter ix) his survey of life and thought, deals with the religion, law, science and literature of this period of Egyptian civilization. Of Babylonia and Assyria relatively little is known, but such were the relations between these countries and the Egyptian and Hittite Empires that some lucky discovery or the excavation of some Kassite town may at any time supply valuable new material. The scanty knowledge we have is summarized by Mr Campbell Thompson (chapter x), continuing his chapter in vol. i on the Kassite conquest.

The Hittites of Asia Minor are introduced to the reader by Dr Hogarth (chapter xi), and the principal problems are specified; while the history of the later Hittites, when the scene has shifted to Syria, is reserved for the following volume. Levantine questions, relating to the Keftians, Philistines and other peoples of the east Mediterranean coasts, are discussed (chapter xii) by Dr Hall, and to him is also due a chapter which carries on the story of art in the near east (chapter xv, compare vol. i, chapter xvi).

As regards the history of Syria and Palestine, the Old Testament itself gives the history of Israel. But scholars, however conservative they may be, find themselves obliged to attempt some sort of reconstruction. The plan here adopted by Dr Cook has been to give first (chapter xiii) an account of those lands, based on the external and contemporary evidence (principally the

Amarna letters) and independent of the Old Testament, and then (chapter xiv) an analysis of the biblical narrative, in order to define the data on which a reconstruction must be founded.

Mr Wace, continuing (chapter xvi) his account of the Aegean (see vol. I, chapter xvii), describes the civilization of Crete in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries at the culmination of its power and influence, and that of the "Mycenaean Empire" which, after the fall of Cnossus, succeeded to the dominating position of Crete in the Aegean. This chapter has a central importance, which is enhanced by the writer's long experience of excavations in the Aegean area.

In the thirteenth century we are in a period to which the traditions of the Greeks reach back. Archaeology enables us, as Mr Wace explains, to fix the approximate times of the fall of Cnossus, the building of the latest palaces at Mycenae and Tiryns, the *floruit* of Homeric Troy; but the exploration of the Aegean lands has not yielded to our curiosity decipherable archives. Hence, although during the last fifty years we have been gaining an ever-growing knowledge of the civilization of the heroic age of Greece which confirms and fills in the picture in Homer, we have no documents like those of Amarna or Boghaz Keui, giving information about political events and enabling us to check or explain or illustrate the traditions. Hence we are still, for the Achaean period, very largely dependent on those traditions, and there is room for widely diverging views. For the last hundred years it has been so usual to treat the traditions with disrespect and scepticism that the treatment of the Achaean period by Professor Bury (chapter xvii) may seem indecently radical just because it is exceptionally conservative¹. As our view of the heroic age depends mainly on our view of the Homeric poems, a chapter (xviii) has been added by the same writer on the Homeric controversy, in which the unitarian doctrine is adopted. The reader will, however, notice that elsewhere in the volume other contributors state or imply a different view of the Homeric poems.

After the Trojan War and the coming of the Iron Age we enter on a period of Aegean history on which, always notoriously obscure, but few and dim lights have been cast by archaeology.

¹ As we go to press news reaches us of the possibility that new light on the Achaeans may presently be forthcoming from Boghaz Keui, and perhaps a confirmation of the results of the Eratosthenic chronology. See Dr Giles in the *Cambridge University Reporter* for March, 1924, p. 685, and Dr Forrer's preliminary announcement in the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, March, col. 113 sqq.

The two main movements, which were to set the stage for classical Greek history, were the Dorian invasions and the settlements of Hellenic peoples on the coasts of Asia Minor. The first is discussed by Mr Wade-Gery (chapter xix); no definite narrative is possible, critical discussion is the only way in which the subject can be usefully treated. The course of the formation of an Asiatic Greece, through the series of movements so important for the future of the Hellenic race (commonly known as the Aeolic and Ionic migrations), is traced by Dr Hogarth (chapter xx).

A chapter (xxi) by Professor Peet, Dr Ashby and Mr Thurlow Leeds, describes the archaeological results of exploration in the area of the western Mediterranean and the extreme western countries of Europe. It takes up such questions as the westward extension of Cretan and Mycenaean influences, the journeys of the Phoenicians, and the identity of the megalith-builders, and forms a link between the introductory chapters by Professor Myres in vol. 1, and the history that will begin in the volumes that follow.

Finally, in chapter xxii Professor Halliday treats of the difficult subject of the religion of the Greeks, its origins and characteristic features, and the structure of their mythology which remained so important a factor in the history of Greek life and literature.

The Editors have to repeat their regret that it has not been possible to provide illustrations without adding very considerably to the cost of the volume. They are, however, glad to be able to announce that the Syndics of the Press have agreed to a separate volume of plates which, it is hoped, may be published in 1925.

Prof. Halliday desires to tender his thanks to Dr L. R. Farnell for reading the first draft of his chapter. To Sir Arthur Evans Mr Wace also wishes to express his acknowledgments. Dr Cook desires to thank Prof. Bevan, and especially Prof. Kennett, and the Rev. W. A. L. Elmslie of Westminster College, Cambridge, for valuable criticisms and suggestions; but for the views expressed in his chapters he himself is solely responsible.

It is again the pleasant duty of the Editors to express their indebtedness to the contributors for the preparation of the bibliographies, for their advice on difficult questions which arose from time to time, and for their cordial co-operation in many ways. Special thanks are due to Mr Godfrey Driver, of Magdalen College, Oxford, for translations of the Amarna letters cited in chapter xiii; and to him and to Mr Campbell Thompson for general Assyriological assistance, and to the latter for Map 4, and the

chronological and other matter in the Appendix (pp. 696-701). Thanks are due also to Dr Hall and Prof. Peet for their advice and assistance in matters Egyptological.

They are indebted to Dr Ashby and Prof. Peet in the preparation of Maps 14 and 15, and to both gentlemen and also Mr Thurlow Leeds and Dr Giles for Map 13; to Dr Hogarth for Map 5; to Prof. Breasted for the plan of Kadesh (p. 69), and to him and to Messrs Scribner's Sons for Maps 1 and 2; to Mr Nelson and the University of Chicago for the plan of Megiddo (p. 145); to Messrs Bartholomew for Map 6; to Messrs A. and C. Black for Map 3; to Messrs Macmillan for the plan of the plain of Troy, from Professor Leaf's *Troy*; to the publishers of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* for the plan of Mycenæ. The plans of the palaces of Cnossus and Tiryns are from the *Cambridge Companion to Greek Studies*. The general and biblical indexes have been made by Mr W. E. C. Browne, M.A., former scholar of Emmanuel College.

The design on the outside cover represents the fine limestone portrait of Ikhnaton, found by the German expedition at Tell el-Amarna.

A list of the more important corrections and additions which have been made in the second edition of vol. I will be found on a separate leaflet.

J. B. B.
S. A. C.
F. E. A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE PEOPLES OF ASIA MINOR

BY PETER GILES, LITT.D., F.B.A.

Reader in Comparative Philology, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| INTRODUCTION | I |
| I. GENERAL PHYSICAL CONDITIONS OF ASIA MINOR | 2 |
| Climate | 3 |
| Rivers | 4 |
| Ethnology | 5 |
| II. THE HITTITES AND OTHER PEOPLES OF ASIA MINOR | 6 |
| Peoples of the Sea | 8 |
| Lycians, Carians | 9 |
| Leleges, Lydians | 10 |
| Etruria | 11 |
| III. INDO-EUROPEANS; CONTACT WITH EUROPE | 12 |
| Phrygians, Paphlagonians | 14 |
| Medes | 15 |
| Linguistic evidence | 16 |
| Later invaders | 17 |
| The Celts of Asia Minor | 18 |

CHAPTER II

THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

BY P. GILES

| | |
|--|----|
| Prehistoric Europe | 20 |
| European types | 22 |
| Italy, Sicily, Albania | 24 |
| The Balkan peninsula | 27 |
| Cretans | 28 |
| Home of the Indo-Europeans | 29 |
| Greece, Macedonia, Thrace | 30 |
| Scythians, Sarmatians, Celts | 32 |
| Red and Black Celts, Galatians | 34 |
| Italic peoples | 36 |
| German peoples | 37 |

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDATION AND EXPANSION OF THE
EGYPTIAN EMPIRE

BY JAMES HENRY BREASTED, PH.D., LL.D., HON. D.LITT. (OXON.)
Professor of Egyptology and Oriental History in the University of Chicago

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. INTERNAL CONDITIONS AND ADMINISTRATION | 40 |
| Expulsion of the Hyksos | 41 |
| New military organization | 42 |
| Character of the administration | 45 |
| Duties of the vizier | 46 |
| Social divisions | 48 |
| Growth of the priesthood | 50 |
| The Valley of the Kings' Tombs | 52 |
| II. THE EXPANSION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF HATSHEPSUT | 53 |
| Thutmose I in Nubia and Asia | 54 |
| Conditions in south-western Asia | 56 |
| The Levant | 58 |
| Conquests in northern Syria | 59 |
| Predominance of Hatshepsut | 60 |
| Hatshepsut's expedition to Punt | 63 |
| Her building enterprises | 64 |

CHAPTER IV

THE REIGN OF THUTMOSE III

By J. H. BREASTED

| | |
|---|----|
| I. THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE | 67 |
| The invasion of Palestine | 68 |
| The battle of Megiddo | 69 |
| The Egyptian victory | 71 |
| Thutmose's second Asiatic campaign | 73 |
| Third to sixth campaigns | 74 |
| Campaign against Mitanni | 76 |
| II. THE EMPIRE OF THUTMOSE III. | 78 |
| Thutmose's monuments | 79 |
| Internal conditions in Egypt | 80 |
| Ninth to thirteenth campaigns | 82 |
| Egyptian sovereignty in south-west Asia | 84 |
| Thutmose's character | 86 |

CHAPTER V

THE ZENITH OF EGYPTIAN POWER AND THE REIGN
OF AMENHOTEP III

By J. H. BREASTED

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. EGYPT MISTRESS OF THE EAST | 88 |
| Revolts in Asia | 89 |
| Work of Amenhotep II | 91 |
| Thutmose IV. | 92 |
| Amenhotep III | 93 |
| Sovereignty in Syria | 94 |
| Letters from Mitanni | 95 |
| Trade and intercourse | 96 |
| Relations with Crete | 97 |
| II. CIVILIZATION AND THE NEW AGE UNDER AMENHOTEP III | 98 |
| Art and architecture | 100 |
| Sculpture | 103 |
| Craftsmanship | 104 |
| Queen Ti | 105 |
| Scarabs of Ti | 106 |
| Troubles in Syria | 107 |

CHAPTER VI

IKHNATON, THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTIONARY

By J. H. BREASTED

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. IKHNATON'S RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT | 109 |
| Pre-existing monotheistic tendencies | 110 |
| Ikhnaton's zeal and iconoclasm | 112 |
| Akhetaton; Tell el-Amarna | 114 |
| The Aton cult | 116 |
| Hymns to Aton | 117 |
| Ikhnaton's ideas and art | 120 |
| II. THE FOREIGN SITUATION AND THE FALL OF IKHNATON | 121 |
| The Hittite advance on Syria | 122 |
| Unrest in Mitanni and Syria | 123 |
| The Habiru | 124 |
| Opposition to Ikhnaton in Egypt | 126 |
| Failure of his reform | 127 |
| The el-Amarna letters | 128 |
| Tutenkhamon | 129 |
| Decay of the dynasty | 130 |

CHAPTER VII

THE AGE OF RAMSES II

By J. H. BREASTED

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| I. THE PREDECESSORS OF RAMSES | 131 |
| The reforms of Harmhab | 132 |
| His long and peaceful reign | 134 |
| Seti I invades Palestine | 135 |
| Egypt recovers Syria | 136 |
| Achievements of Seti I in Egypt | 138 |
| II. THE WARS AND FOREIGN RELATIONS OF RAMSES II | 139 |
| The Hittite league against Egypt | 141 |
| Egyptian advance upon Kadesh | 142 |
| The battle of Kadesh | 143 |
| The Egyptian victory | 146 |
| The results | 148 |
| Treaty between Egypt and the Hittites | 149 |
| • Marriage alliance | 150 |
| III. THE CIVILIZATION OF THE AGE OF RAMSES II | 151 |
| Building enterprises | 152 |
| Foreign intercourse | 153 |
| Syrian influence in Egypt | 155 |
| Internal conditions | 156 |
| Ethics and religion | 158 |
| Personal religion and morality | 160 |
| A new threat to Egypt | 162 |

CHAPTER VIII

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE

By J. H. BREASTED

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. MERNEPTAH AND RAMSES III; THE EMPIRE ON THE DEFENSIVE | 164 |
| Unrest in the Levant | 165 |
| The great Libyan invasion | 166 |
| Merneptah's victory | 168 |
| The 'Israel' stele | 169 |
| Internal unrest and anarchy | 170 |
| Fresh Levantine attacks | 173 |
| Fighting on land and sea | 174 |
| The victories of Ramses III | 175 |
| Decline of Egyptian and Hittite power | 176 |
| II. THE INTERNAL DECAY OF THE EMPIRE | 177 |
| State of the Empire under Ramses III | 178 |
| Decay of art | 180 |
| Growth of priestly power | 181 |
| Increased wealth of the temples | 182 |
| Internal crises | 184 |
| The great harem conspiracy | 186 |

CONTENTS

xv

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| III. THE LAST OF THE RAMESSIDS AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE EMPIRE | 188 |
| The priest Amenhotep | 189 |
| The independence of the Delta. | 191 |
| The story of Wenamon | 192 |
| Loss of Egyptian prestige in Phoenicia | 194 |
| The supremacy of the priesthood | 195 |

CHAPTER IX

CONTEMPORARY LIFE AND THOUGHT IN EGYPT

By T. ERIC PEET, M.A.

Professor of Egyptology, Liverpool University

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. RELIGION; IKHNATON'S REFORM | 196 |
| Comparison with the Middle Kingdom | 197 |
| The Book of the Dead | 198 |
| Spells | 199 |
| Magic and morals | 201 |
| Prelude to Ikhnaton's reform | 203 |
| Nature of the reform | 205 |
| Causes of its failure | 207 |
| Personal piety | 208 |
| General decay of religion. | 209 |
| II. LAW | 210 |
| Criminal law | 211 |
| Civil law | 212 |
| Civil actions | 214 |
| III. THE SCIENCES | 215 |
| Mathematics | 216 |
| Astronomy | 218 |
| Medicine and magic | 219 |
| Diagnosis | 220 |
| IV. LITERATURE | 221 |
| Comparison with the Middle Kingdom | 222 |
| Stories and romance | 223 |
| Hymns, letters and satires. | 224 |
| Love songs | 225 |

CHAPTER X

ASSYRIA

By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A.

Fellow of Merton College, Oxford

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN COAST LANDS | 227 |
| The horse | 228 |
| The Kassites | 229 |
| Mitanni | 230 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Egypt in Asia | 231 |
| The Euphrates as barrier | 232 |
| The Amarna period | 234 |
| Energy of Ashur-uballit | 235 |
| Victories of Enlil-nirari | 236 |
| Assyrian expansion under Adad-nirari | 239 |
| II. THE EMERGENCE OF ASSYRIA | 240 |
| Shalmaneser, Tukulti-Ninurta | 241 |
| Defeats of the Kassites | 242 |
| The <i>kudurrus</i> | 244 |
| The Kassite people | 245 |
| New Babylonian dynasty | 246 |
| Nebuchadrezzar I | 247 |
| Assyrian expansion in the north-west | 248 |
| Campaigns of Tiglath-pileser I | 249 |
| Campaign to the Mediterranean | 250 |

CHAPTER XI

THE HITTITES OF ASIA MINOR

By D. G. HOGARTH, C.M.G., D.LITT.

Keeper of the Ashmolean; Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. NAME, DISTRIBUTION, SOURCES | 252 |
| Sources of information | 253 |
| Hittite hieroglyphs | 254 |
| II. EARLIEST PERIOD, CAPPADOCIA | 256 |
| The Assyro-Cappadocian texts | 257 |
| Early Assyrian domination in Asia Minor | 258 |
| Origin of the Hatti | 259 |
| III. THE RISE AND FALL OF THE HATTI DYNASTY | 260 |
| Conquests of Shubbiluliuma | 261 |
| Invasion of Syria | 262 |
| The Syrian principalities | 263 |
| Relations with Egypt | 264 |
| Hattushil II | 265 |
| The treaty with Egypt | 266 |
| End of the Hattic empire | 267 |
| Invasion of hordes | 268 |
| IV. CIVILIZATION | 269 |
| Art | 270 |
| Lesser states of east Asia Minor | 272 |

CHAPTER XII

THE KEFTIANS, PHILISTINES AND OTHER PEOPLES
OF THE LEVANT

By H. R. HALL, D.LITT., F.S.A.

Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. THE KEFTIANS AND THE PEOPLES OF THE SEA | 275 |
| Egyptian references to the Mediterranean | 276 |
| The Minoan Keftians | 278 |
| Caphtor and Keftiu | 279 |
| The Peoples of the Sea | 281 |
| Lycians, Achaeans | 282 |
| II. THE PHILISTINE MIGRATION | 283 |
| The Pulesati | 284 |
| Cherethites and Pelethites | 285 |
| The identification of Caphtor | 286 |
| The Philistines and Crete | 288 |
| III. THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PHILISTINES IN CANAAN | 289 |
| Scanty traces in Palestine | 290 |
| Organization, weapons | 291 |
| Pottery, architecture | 293 |
| Cultural affinities | 294 |

CHAPTER XIII

SYRIA AND PALESTINE IN THE LIGHT
OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

By STANLEY A. COOK, LITT.D.

Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

| | |
|---|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 296 |
| I. THE AMARNA AGE: HATTI AND MITANNI | 297 |
| The Amarna age | 298 |
| Hittites and Mitanni | 299 |
| The fate of Mitanni | 301 |
| II. PHOENICIA AND AMOR IN THE AMARNA LETTERS | 302 |
| The Amorite revolt against Egypt | 303 |
| The attack on Phoenicia | 304 |
| The fall of Byblus | 306 |
| Treachery of Aziru the Amorite | 308 |
| III. THE LEBANONS AND PALESTINE IN THE AMARNA LETTERS | 309 |
| The revolt in Syria | 310 |
| The movements in central Palestine | 312 |
| Jerusalem and south Palestine | 315 |
| Jerusalem threatened | 316 |
| Period of confusion | 317 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| IV. OUTLINE OF HISTORY FROM FOURTEENTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY . . . | 318 |
| Decline of Hatti and Egypt | 320 |
| V. RELATIONS WITH EGYPT | 321 |
| The Egyptian administration | 322 |
| Semitic officials in the Egyptian service | 323 |
| Messenger service | 325 |
| Satire of a scribe | 326 |
| Intercourse with Egypt | 328 |
| Material culture in Syria | 329 |
| VI. LANGUAGE AND WRITING | 330 |
| Current languages | 331 |
| Knowledge of Babylonian | 333 |
| Use of the cuneiform script | 334 |
| Records of letters, messengers, etc. | 335 |
| VII. STYLE AND IDEAS | 336 |
| Style of the Amarna letters | 337 |
| Parallels in the O.T. | 338 |
| The Pharaoh and the gods | 340 |
| Religious and related ideas | 343 |
| VIII. THE DEITIES | 345 |
| Native gods of Palestine | 347 |
| Astarte, Addu, Baal, Yahweh | 348 |
| Tendencies to monolatry | 350 |
| Absence of Yahweh-worship | 351 |

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

By S. A. Cook

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. THE OLD TESTAMENT NARRATIVE | 352 |
| The Biblical history | 353 |
| Its general character | 355 |
| Scanty external confirmation | 356 |
| II. THE ACCOUNT OF THE EXODUS AND THE CONQUEST | 358 |
| The patriarchs as settlers | 359 |
| Variant traditions of Exodus and Conquest | 360 |
| Moses and Aaron | 362 |
| The Kadesh traditions | 365 |
| Edomite and Israelite interrelations | 367 |
| III. THE ACCOUNT OF THE RISE OF THE MONARCHY | 369 |
| The prelude to its rise | 370 |
| Conflicting traditions | 371 |
| Traditions of Saul and David | 372 |
| Complexity of the traditions | 374 |
| IV. PALESTINE, PHOENICIA AND THE PHILISTINES | 376 |
| Pre-Mitannian period | 377 |
| Rise of Phoenicia | 378 |
| Significance of Philistia | 379 |

CONTENTS

xix

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| V. ISRAEL, JUDAH AND KING SAUL | 381 |
| Tendencies of the Biblical history | 383 |
| Archaeology and criticism | 384 |
| The age of the 'Judges' | 386 |
| Importance of Shechem | 387 |
| Saul and his wars on the south | 389 |
| Relations between central and south Palestine | 390 |
| VI. DAVID AND SOLOMON | 392 |
| Judah and Edom | 393 |
| The Davidic idea | 394 |
| David, Solomon and Jerusalem | 396 |
| VII. SOME CONTEMPORARY IDEAS | 397 |
| Ideas of 'righteousness' | 398 |
| Ikhнатon's reform and Palestine | 399 |
| Ideas of Right and Order | 400 |
| Significance of the ideas of the period | 402 |
| The rise of Yahwism | 404 |
| Truth of idea rather than of fact | 406 |

CHAPTER XV

THE CONTEMPORARY ART OF EGYPT AND THE NEAR EAST

By H. R. HALL

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT; ARCHITECTURE, SCULPTURE, ETC. | 407 |
| Relation between the New and the Middle Empire | 409 |
| Sculpture of the XVIIIth Dynasty | 410 |
| Portraiture and caricature | 412 |
| Funerary art: <i>ushabtis</i> and scarabs | 414 |
| II. SMALL ART, COSTUME, POTTERY, ETC. | 415 |
| Scarabs, inlays | 416 |
| Glazes, glass | 417 |
| Carved ivory and wood | 419 |
| Costume and toilet | 420 |
| Textiles and leather-work | 423 |
| Woodwork, pottery | 424 |
| III. SYRIA AND THE EAST | 426 |
| Art in Syria, Cilicia and Cyprus | 427 |
| Hittite and Assyrian art | 428 |
| Later Assyrian art | 430 |

CHAPTER XVI

CRETE AND MYCENAE

By A. J. B. WACE, M.A.

Formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge; Late Director of the British School of Archaeology, Athens

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. CRETE: LATE MINOAN I | 431 |
| Palaces of Cnossus and Phaestus | 432 |
| Minoan art | 434 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Minoan costume | 436 |
| Extent of Minoan influence | 437 |
| Crete and Egypt | 438 |
| II. CRETE: LATE MINOAN II. | 439 |
| Character of the culture | 440 |
| III. THE FALL OF CRETE: LATE MINOAN III | 441 |
| Cause of Cretan supremacy | 442 |
| Fall of Minoan power | 443 |
| Character of the culture | 444 |
| Transition to the Iron Age | 446 |
| IV. THE CYCLADES | 448 |
| Relations with Crete | 449 |
| V. THE GREEK MAINLAND: MYCENAE | 450 |
| Cretan influence | 451 |
| Shaft-graves of Mycenae | 452 |
| Bee-hive tombs | 455 |
| VI. THE SUPREMACY OF MYCENAE | 456 |
| The palace and citadel of Mycenae | 457 |
| The palace and citadel of Tiryns | 458 |
| Spread of Mycenaean culture | 459 |
| Mycenaean life | 460 |
| Pottery of the period | 464 |
| Religion and burial | 465 |
| Decay of Mycenae | 466 |
| The Dorian invasion | 467 |
| VII. THESSALY, MACEDONIA AND TROY | 468 |
| Problems of Thessalian pottery | 469 |
| Local culture | 470 |
| Troy | 471 |
| The coming of the Iron Age | 472 |

CHAPTER XVII

THE ACHAEANS AND THE TROJAN WAR

By J. B. BURY, M.A., F.B.A.

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. ACHAEAN GREECE | 473 |
| Theory of invasion from the north | 474 |
| Spread of the Achaeans | 475 |
| The Pelasgians | 476 |
| Wars of Argos and Thebes | 477 |
| The heroic age | 478 |
| The Homeric catalogue | 479 |
| Supremacy of Mycenae | 482 |
| Political organization | 483 |
| Character of society | 484 |
| Minstrelsy, language, religion | 485 |
| Piracy | 486 |

CONTENTS

xxi

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| II. THE TROJAN WAR | 487 |
| The Dardanians | 488 |
| The fortress of Troy | 489 |
| Resources of Trojan kings | 491 |
| Causes of Trojan war | 492 |
| Criticism of the story | 494 |
| Historical elements | 495 |
| Sequel to the fall of Troy. | 496 |
| Pelopids and Perseids; the Trojan era | 497 |

CHAPTER XVIII

HOMER

By J. B. BURY

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. THE HOMERIC POEMS | 498 |
| Plot of the <i>Iliad</i> | 499 |
| The Epic cycle | 500 |
| II. THE HOMERIC CONTROVERSY | 502 |
| D'Aubignac and Wolf | 503 |
| Theories of Expansion: Grote | 504 |
| U. von Wilamowitz-Möllerhoff | 505 |
| The postulates underlying the theories | 506 |
| The date of Homer. | 507 |
| Antiquity of writing | 508 |
| Language of the Epics | 509 |
| III. HISTORICAL TRADITIONS IN THE <i>Iliad</i> | 510 |
| Historical reality of the heroes | 511 |
| Consistent archaism in Homer | 513 |
| Homer's material | 514 |
| The Olympian machinery | 515 |
| The rôle of the gods | 517 |

CHAPTER XIX

THE DORIANS

By H. T. WADE-GERY, M.A., M.C.
Fellow and Tutor, Wadham College, Oxford

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. THE TRADITIONS: LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE | 518 |
| The evidence of the dialects | 519 |
| II. A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD | 520 |
| Geometric art | 521 |
| From Mycenaean to Geometric | 522 |
| Evidence of iron, etc. | 524 |
| III. THE DORIAN TRIBES | 525 |
| The story of Aegimius | 526 |
| Aegimius in Thessaly | 527 |
| Dorians in Crete and Rhodes | 528 |
| Origin of the Dorians | 530 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| IV. THE CONQUEST | 531 |
| 'The Return of the Heraclids' | 533 |
| Corinth, Megara | 534 |
| Aegina, Sparta | 535 |
| Arcadia | 536 |
| Arcadian and Dorian colonization | 537 |
| V. SPARTA | 538 |
| Capture of Amyclae | 539 |
| Perioikoi and Helots | 540 |
| Pylos, Messenia | 541 |

CHAPTER XX

HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

BY D. G. HOGARTH

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. THE MAIN TRADITIONS | 542 |
| Several stages of settlement | 543 |
| Different social phases | 544 |
| The Ionian Migration | 545 |
| The dates | 546 |
| Mallus and Troy | 547 |
| II. THE RESISTANCE OF IONIA AND ITS CAUSE | 548 |
| Early Anatolian monarchies | 549 |
| Asiatic origin of Humanism | 550 |
| Pre-Ionian civilization | 551 |
| Early colonies | 552 |
| III. THE EARLIER 'CARO-LELEGIAN' CIVILIZATION | 553 |
| Archaeological evidence | 554 |
| Leleges and Carians | 556 |
| Phoenician influence | 557 |
| IV. THE PROCESS OF SETTLEMENT | 558 |
| Secondary colonization | 559 |
| Milesian colonies | 560 |
| Motive of colonization | 561 |

CHAPTER XXI

THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

BY PROFESSOR PEET, DR THOMAS ASHBY, D.LITT., F.S.A., Director of the British School at Rome, and E. THURLOW LEEDS, M.A., F.S.A., Assistant Keeper of the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford¹

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. ITALY AND SICILY | 563 |
| Early traces of man | 563 |
| Sergi's 'Mediterranean Race' | 564 |
| Neolithic civilization | 565 |

¹ Professor Peet is mainly responsible for Sections I and V, Dr Ashby for Sections II and III, both for Section VI, and Mr Leeds for Section IV.

CONTENTS

xxiii

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Copper Age | 566 |
| Bronze Age; new influences | 567 |
| The <i>Terremare</i> | 568 |
| Bronze Age in Sicily | 570 |
| Transition to Early Iron Age | 571 |
| Etruscan civilization | 573 |
| The Latian tombs | 574 |
| II. THE MALTESE ISLANDS AND NORTH AFRICA | 575 |
| Prehistoric Malta | 575 |
| Neolithic period, Hal-Tarxien | 576 |
| Hal-Saffieni | 577 |
| Bronze Age in Malta | 578 |
| North Africa, connections with West Mediterranean | 579 |
| Physical types | 580 |
| III. SARDINIA, CORSICA AND THE BALEARIC ISLANDS | 581 |
| The megaliths of Sardinia | 581 |
| The <i>nuraghi</i> | 583 |
| Bronze and Minoan Ages | 584 |
| IV. THE IBERIAN PENINSULA | 585 |
| Lower palaeolithic and Caspian periods | 585 |
| Iberian influence on neolithic culture | 586 |
| Transition to Bronze Age | 587 |
| The megaliths and their distribution | 588 |
| Doubtful relations with the Levant | 590 |
| V. FRANCE AND THE BRITISH ISLES | 591 |
| Neolithic period in France | 591 |
| Megaliths of Brittany | 592 |
| The La Tène culture | 593 |
| Neolithic and early Bronze Ages in England | 594 |
| Origin of the physical types | 595 |
| VI. THE MEGALITH-BUILDERS | 597 |
| Origin of west European megaliths | 597 |
| The 'migration' and other theories | 598 |
| Theory of Iberian origin | 600 |

CHAPTER XXII

THE RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF THE GREEKS

By W. R. HALLIDAY, B.LITT.

Rathbone Professor of Ancient History in the University of Liverpool

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEK POLYTHEISM | 602 |
| Multiplicity of gods. | 603 |
| Homer and Hesiod | 604 |
| Combined influence of poetry and art | 606 |
| II. GREEK MYTHS AND THE WORSHIP OF POWERS OF NATURE | 607 |
| Interpretations of mythology | 608 |
| Slight personification of powers of nature | 610 |
| Earth-cult | 611 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| III. AEGEAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN ELEMENTS IN GREEK RELIGION. | |
| Aegean religion | 612 |
| Cretan cults | 614 |
| Orgiastic cults | 615 |
| Aegean survivals | 616 |
| The goddesses | 617 |
| Lycaean Zeus | 618 |
| IV. PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS | 619 |
| Human sacrifice | 620 |
| Its mitigation | 621 |
| Cult of animals | 622 |
| Theriomorphism | 623 |
| V. HOMERIC RELIGION | 624 |
| Ethical characteristics | 625 |
| The priests and sacrifice | 626 |
| Eschatology | 627 |
| Cults of the dead | 628 |
| VI. THE OLYMPIAN GODS | 629 |
| Zeus | 630 |
| Hera, Poseidon | 631 |
| Apollo | 632 |
| Artemis | 634 |
| Athena | 635 |
| Demeter | 636 |
| Hermes, Hephaestus | 637 |
| Ares, Aphrodite | 638 |
| VII. POLITICAL ASPECTS OF GREEK RELIGION | 639 |
| City and other communal cults | 640 |
| Religious policy of the Tyrants | 641 |
| Persistence of the old religion | 642 |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | 643 |

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER I | 645 |
| CHAPTER II | 649 |
| CHAPTERS III—VIII | 652 |
| CHAPTER IX | 655 |
| CHAPTER X | 657 |
| CHAPTER XI | 659 |
| CHAPTER XII | 661 |
| CHAPTER XIII | 664 |
| CHAPTER XIV | 667 |
| CHAPTER XV | 671 |
| CHAPTER XVI | 676 |
| CHAPTER XVII | 677 |
| CHAPTER XVIII | 678 |
| CHAPTER XIX | 680 |
| CHAPTER XX | 684 |
| CHAPTER XXI | 685 |
| CHAPTER XXII | 690 |

CONTENTS

xxv

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE | 692 |
| THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KASSITE PERIOD | 696 |
| SYNCHRONISTIC LIST OF KINGS | 699 |
| LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS | 702 |
| LEADING DATES IN EARLY GREEK HISTORY ACCORDING TO THE COMPUTATION OF ERATOSTHENES | 704 |
| GENERAL INDEX | 705 |
| INDEX TO MAPS | 741 |
| INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES | 749 |

LIST OF MAPS, ETC.

| | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| 1. Map of Egypt and the Ancient World | FACING | 80 |
| 2. The Asiatic Empire of Egypt | " | 96 |
| 3. Egypt after the Egyptian Monuments of the 15th-13th cent. B.C. Syria and the Amarna Letters | " | 144 |
| 4. Assyria and Babylonia | " | 250 |
| 5. Sketch Map of the Hittite Area | " | 272 |
| 6. Upper Egypt, Sinai and South Palestine | " | 352 |
| 7. Palestine: The Israelite Tribes | " | 368 |
| 8. Physical Map of Palestine | " | 406 |
| 9. Achaean Greece and its Neighbours | " | 474 |
| 10. The Peloponnesus c. 1200 B.C. | " | 478 |
| 11. Central and Northern Greece | " | 480 |
| 12. Asia Minor | " | 544 |
| 13. The Mediterranean Basin | " | 562 |
| 14. Italy (and Sicily) from the Palaeolithic to the Early Iron Age | " | 574 |
| 15. Malta, Gozo | " | 578 |
| Plans: The battle of Megiddo | | 69 |
| The battle of Kadesh | | 145 |
| Cnossus | FACING | 450 |
| Tiryns | " | " |
| Mycenae | " | " |
| Plain of Troy | " | 496 |

CHAPTER I

THE PEOPLES OF ASIA MINOR

IN the period upon which we are about to enter, the peoples of south-west Asia, Egypt and south-east Europe were brought into very close contact one with another. Peaceful trading-journeys, ambitious wars by land and by sea, and some sweeping ethnical movements, which had the profoundest consequences for history, made the area virtually one inter-connected whole. The history of no portion of this whole can properly be viewed quite apart from the rest, although naturally it will be necessary to treat each part by itself, and with reference to its own peculiar development and problems. The available sources, moreover, although by no means inconsiderable in quantity, vary greatly as regards quality; both the archaeological and the written materials are often difficult to interpret, or are susceptible of different interpretations, and may be treated from different points of view. Further, the far-reaching political and other changes which mark this period can be best understood only by taking a wider survey of the interrelations between Asia, Africa and Europe which illumine the particular vicissitudes now to be described. To a certain extent this has already been done in volume I (see especially chapters I, II and V). Accordingly, the chapters in this volume are drawn up so as to assist the reader to grasp the period and the area as a whole, and also in their various parts and aspects, though at the unavoidable cost of some repetition and overlapping.

Once more (see vol. I, p. 181) the history of Egypt holds the premier position, owing mainly to its relations with south-west Asia and the peoples of the East Mediterranean. But Asia Minor now assumes a unique significance, partly because, as the bridge between Europe and Asia, it was the centre of the most intricate developments of the period, and partly also because the rich store of cuneiform tablets discovered at Boghaz Keui, and the problems of the 'Hittites,' and all their ramifications are proving to be of more fundamental importance than could ever have been suspected. Accordingly, chapters on the peoples of Asia Minor and of Europe form an appropriate introduction, and deal with linguistic problems, and with certain important migrations.

I. GENERAL PHYSICAL CONDITIONS
OF ASIA MINOR

It is still too early to claim that the history of the peoples of Asia Minor may be written with certainty. Rarely crossed by European travellers since the Turkish conquest till the nineteenth century, and still more rarely by scholars desirous to learn its distant past and competent to judge of what they saw, it may be said that Asia Minor was first revealed to the world by the French traveller Texier, and by the British geologist W. J. Hamilton, who started on his memorable expedition in 1835. Since then, French, German and English scholars have been diligent in the study of its geographical features and of its antiquities. But the excavation of the site of Troy was the first attempt on a large scale to widen our knowledge with the help of the spade. To America by the excavation in recent times of Sardes and to Germany by the unearthing of the records of the ancient Anatolian Empire at Boghaz Keui has fallen the glory of revealing its history in days when Greek commerce and Greek language had not yet conquered the vast area that lies between the Black Sea and the Gulf of Alexandretta, between the Aegean and the mountains of Anti-Taurus and Armenia.

To the ancients indeed the bounds of the peninsula towards the east were vague and uncertain. Strabo proposed to draw a line from the eastern end of the plain of Tarsus to Sinope or Amisus (Samsun) on the Black Sea¹. Such a line would form no proper geographical boundary, though at an earlier period such a division might have commended itself to the Greeks, who felt that with the winding Halys ended even vague knowledge of the interior of the peninsula.

Geographically Asia Minor is a curious land. If one may use a homely image, the peninsula may be compared to a gigantic inverted pie-dish, the bottom of which is surrounded by a raised foot. The narrow lip of the inverted vessel is raised but little above sea-level. Behind rises the body of the dish to an average height of 3000 to 3500 feet, and surrounding this is the foot formed on the south by the great Taurus range, and continued to the north-east by Anti-Taurus. This mighty rampart the invader has generally found invincible. The Cilician Gates above Tarsus are an entrance and an exit made by human hands, and, being unapproachable by a host in days before artillery, were not difficult to hold by a small

¹ Strabo, XIV, p. 664.

but determined force. A slight change of ground for the defenders still leaves the pass impregnable. The last invaders of the peninsula who have made good its possession—the Turks—came in to it by the mountains of Armenia far to the east. The range of Amanus which forms the dividing line between the plain of Tarsus in Cilicia and Syria is less formidable. Access also from Mesopotamia is not difficult, and the powerful states of that region at an early period availed themselves of this route to the metal-working areas near the Black Sea.

On the north side, though the interior is cut off from the sea by similar though lower ranges of mountains, the foot is neither so continuous nor so difficult of access. On the north-west and the west the peninsula is more vulnerable. From the plain of Troy or along the valleys of the Hermus and the Maeander lay the routes for trade and for war. The Crusaders with Godfrey gathered at Dorylaeum (Eski-Shehr); Cyrus the younger started from Sardes on the Hermus for his expedition to distant Babylon against his brother Artaxerxes; and at Celaenae, the later Apamea, Alexander's forces converged when they were to set out upon the conquest of the Persian Empire to its farthest eastern bounds.

The climatic conditions of the great central plateau of Asia Minor are very different from those of its coast lands. Its rivers descending from the lofty heights of the table-land bring down with them great quantities of solid matter, which in the course of ages have extended the coast line far out to sea, and produced a low-lying, marshy, and malarious area at the foot of the steep slopes which ascend to the central plain. The island of Lade, off which the Greeks and Persians fought a battle in 494 B.C., is now a hill some miles inland. The central plain is to a large extent treeless and better suited for pasture than for agriculture. The climate of this area is continental; the summers are hot and the winters severe. The slopes which border the southern side of the Black Sea, on the other hand, form one of the most beautiful countries in the world, rich in forest, in fruit trees and in flowering plants. East of Trebizond the rhododendron and the azalea, here upon their native soil, blossom in the greatest profusion. The alluvial soil of the western shores is deep and rich, a land fit for the growth and maintenance of great cities which could draw to themselves the wealth in corn and wool of the hinterland, and well provided with harbours from which daring mariners might carry to north and south and west the rich products which had accumulated in their towns. On the south the plain of Cilicia was probably always unwholesome from its malarious marshes, but it

was important as connecting Asia Minor with its southern neighbours, Syria and Palestine.

By far the most important of the rivers of Asia Minor was the Halys (now the Kizil Irmak or Red River), which, rising in the mountains of the lesser Armenia, runs for some distance in a westerly direction, almost parallel to the Euphrates, and having made a tremendous curve to the south-west turns gradually northwards and finds its way to the Black Sea some thirty or forty miles to the north-west of Samsun. Of less importance are other northward-flowing rivers, the Iris, east of the Halys, formed by the junction of the ancient Scylax and Lycus and, much farther to the west, the Sangarius which, emptying itself into the Black Sea some sixty or seventy miles east of the Bosphorus, seems to make the eastern boundary of Homer's knowledge. From its banks Priam of Troy brought Hecuba to be his bride and there he fought against the mysterious women warriors, the Amazons, whose legend in the lands east of the Halys is not even now extinct.

Apart from the Halys the most important of Anatolian rivers are those which flow westwards. The Simois and Scamander of Troy would have had no importance in the world had it not been that the Homeric epic of the tale of Troy centred on their banks. The Caïcus flowing south-westwards not far from the later Pergamum; the Hermus traversing a comparatively narrow valley on the southern slope of which stood Sardes the capital of the Lydian Empire and Magnesia near Mount Sipylus, and entering a bay on the southern side of which stood Smyrna; the Cayster through marshes famed for water-fowl reaching the sea at Ephesus; the Maeander pouring through a broad valley studded on either side by famous cities—all these play an important part in Greek history and legend. In the mountainous country of Lycia the rivers are naturally shorter and less important. Through picturesque gorges the Sarus (Seihun) and the Pyramus (Jihun) break out into the Cilician plain which owes its extent to them, though they are too swift to be of use for the exploitation of the mountainous country inland.

In this mountainous country volcanic rocks, through which run veins of valuable metals, rise here and there amid the prevalent limestone of the peninsula. Probably the earliest inroads into Asia which history as yet records are those of enterprising traders from Mesopotamia, who have left behind them evidence in pottery and inscriptions of their presence more than twenty centuries before Christ. At Kültepe, south of the great bend of the Halys near Caesarea Mazaca, there seems to have been an

emporium for the iron forged by the Chalybes far to the north on the slopes nearer to the Black Sea between Samsun and Trebizond, a mysterious people living in dens and caves of the earth, giving rise to legends of mysterious dwarfs, and supplying the Greeks with a name for steel, which seems to have become known to them first from this area. This country is rich in minerals, Strabo speculates on the relation between the name of the Chalybes and Alybe, whence according to Homer was the origin of silver¹. It is possible in the case of foreign names that the phonetic laws of Greek did not hold and that some connection did exist. In modern times a relation has been seen between Alybe and the word *silver*, and the existence according to Pliny of a river Sidenum and a tribe of Sideni, to which Strabo adds a town Side, suggests that here also may be the origin of *Sidēros*, the Greek word for iron, the etymology of which is unknown².

It is probable that, from the earliest times, on the central plains at least and extending down into the mountainous country to the south-west was a population with a striking physiognomy which is still common amongst the Armenian population of to-day. Of this population the special characteristics are a prominent nose in line with a forehead receding and rising to an unusual height. How far this strange configuration of head is natural and how far increased by the practice of mothers to tie very tightly round the heads of their babies a towel, which when soaked in water exercises great pressure upon the tender bones of infancy, is still a matter of dispute amongst experts. Probably art has only increased the sloping forehead given by nature, and the Hittite warriors of the fourteenth century B.C. and the Armenians of to-day have the same characteristic profile. It may be fairly assumed that the rich coast-lands drew from very early times invaders to establish themselves, and throughout history we find on the sea-level a population differing from that which holds the great central plain, much as along the eastern shore of the Adriatic the coast population has generally differed from that of the inland country high above it. The pastoral people of the plateau, however, must in early times have been to some extent migratory because of the difficulty of keeping their flocks alive during the stress of winter. Just as to this day the sheep of the highlands of Scotland migrate to the lowlands in winter where food is more plentiful and accessible, so in Asia Minor the primitive Anatolian.

¹ Strabo, XII, p. 549; *Iliad*, II, 857.

² Pliny, *N.H.* VI, 11; Strabo, XII, p. 548. Sayce (*C.R.* 1922, p. 19) suggests that *χαλκός* may be derived from Khalki whence copper came.

shepherd must have moved towards the coast in the winter season. Geographical conditions tend to produce the same results in distant ages, and the migratory Yürüks of modern times, though nominally of an alien stock, really only reproduce the practice of the primitive age. In both periods the development of a strong people along the coast was bound to hamper and ultimately to limit in a great degree the ancient summer and winter migrations of the flocks.

II. THE HITTITES AND OTHER PEOPLES OF ASIA MINOR

This country of Asia Minor, ever since history began, has been a country of passage between East and West, and its whole history is a record of migrations to and fro across it from Central Asia to Europe or from Europe to Central Asia, Afghanistan and India. Out of the aboriginal people seems to have grown the mighty empire of the Hittites, who, though known to us from the O.T. as settled in Palestine, were only, as we now learn, immigrants into that area and had their home much farther to the north. In the area where we find them prominent in the earliest times there was a people known to the Greeks of the Roman period as the White Syrians (*Λευκόσυροι*). The epithet White was apparently given to them to distinguish them from the Phoenicians or Red Syrians, and it is noticeable that in Egyptian art the Hittites are represented as of a paler colour than the red Phoenicians.

The ethnological and philological relations of this stock are still uncertain. The kings of Babylon, according to legend, were in touch with them nearly 3000 years before Christ. From Tell el-Amarna and from Assyria come two fragments which relate the story of the campaign made by Sargon I into Cappadocia in the third year of his reign, in order to relieve the Babylonian colony of traders at Ganesh (Kanes) from the attacks of the king of Burushkhanda. In Ganesh we recognize the modern Kültepe, a colony which had been founded by the city of Kish in southern Babylonia. Sargon's date is fixed about 2850 B.C. Some 600 years later are dated the cuneiform inscriptions found at Kültepe, which were the records of a business house in the colony. From about 1800 B.C. the Hittites come more fully into the light of history.

Since the beginning of the archaeological exploration of Asia Minor stone carvings of a very characteristic kind have been found in various parts. Some are obviously under the influence of Assyrian art but others bear a distinctive character of their own. One of the largest known and one of the most striking,

though also probably one of the latest in date, is the famous rock carving of Ivriz, in a gorge ascending from the Lycaonian plain not many miles from Eregli. There is represented a scene of a king clothed in an embroidered robe and a mantle, in an attitude of supplication before a larger and sturdier figure, which obviously represents a deity of vegetation, for in his right hand he holds a vine branch with three great clusters of grapes, and in his left he grasps a handful of ears of corn. On the rock between the face of the deity and the upheld corn ears is an inscription in the peculiar hieroglyphics which we now know to be of the Hittites. The dress of the god is simpler than that of his worshipper, being a tunic with a downward curving hem making a point in front. Round his waist he wears an ornamental girdle. Both figures have thick curly hair reaching to the nape of the neck and curly beards. Experts assign these figures to the eighth century B.C. To a much earlier period belong some figures of the Sun-god Teshub, with a curly beard well known in Assyrian sculpture, but with his hair in a long queue under a bell-shaped cap. He too wears a tunic with a belt in which is thrust a sword. Round the tunic runs an ornamental hem and on his feet he has shoes with upturned toes. In his right hand the god wields a battle-axe and in his left he holds the symbol of the lightning, which might be compared to a scourge with three thongs.

For the history of the Hittites before the fifteenth century B.C. our information is very scanty, but it would seem that gradually they pushed down into the valley of the Euphrates on the one side, and into western Syria and Palestine on the other. The later Assyrians have indeed been well described as Hittites who had adopted the civilization of Babylon. Their pressure along the Mediterranean coast brought them in time into contact with Egypt, whose conquests were spreading upwards from the south. From the annals of Thutmose III we learn that he more than once received presents from the princes of Kheta and we can still see the representations of envoys bringing gifts and of subject princes of Keftiu and Kheta. The details belong to the history of Egypt, see pp. 77, 82. In later centuries a Hittite kingdom existed with its centre at Carchemish, but its importance was secondary and in 717 B.C. it succumbed finally to the Assyrians.

Ramses II is said to have subdued the 'Peoples of the Sea', a vague title which it is hardly possible as yet to define with accuracy. It is clear that these people were not merely raiding brigands, but migrated from land to land with all their belongings, their wives and children, much as the Gauls of a later date attacked

and occupied, for a time at least, various parts of Europe and even of Asia (see chap. XII). Their name survives in the mysterious peoples whom the Greeks called Pelasgoi (Πελασγοί). The term is a quite regular derivative from the stem of πέλαγος the sea, and the ending -κός, frequently employed in tribal names. To the Greeks themselves these peoples were, in later times, nothing but a name. They identified them on the coast of Thrace, in Lemnos, in Attica at the very foot of the Acropolis, in north-west Greece, in Crete, in Italy and other places. But what tongue they spoke, whence they came, or whither they went, they were entirely unable to tell. In the time of Herodotus the Pelasgians were still to be found in Thrace in the neighbourhood of the Hellespont. Their language Herodotus regarded as non-Greek. In the Athenians and Ionians he saw a Pelasgian people who had become Hellenized¹. In truth it was not unnatural that the ancients should not be able to define the race or the language of the Pelasgians, for like other rovers of ancient and modern times they were probably neither of one race nor of one speech. Thus they are no doubt accurately described in the Great Karnak inscription by the Egyptians as 'northerners coming from all lands'².

In the letters from Tell el-Amarna before the middle of the fourteenth century B.C. mention is made of certain tribes, Danuna, Shardina, Shakalsha, which with greater or less certainty have been identified with Greek Danai, men of Sardes or of Sardinia, and men of Sagalassus, north of Pisidia. In the reign of Ramses II (about 1290 B.C.) they have become very formidable and in combination with the Hittites and other foes are a serious danger to Egypt. The identifications, in the imperfect Egyptian method of writing the names, are again necessarily uncertain. But with fair probability there may be distinguished Lycians, Cilicians, Dardani presumably from Troy-land, and more doubtfully men from Mysia and Pedasus. Ramses II was successful in staving off the evil day when Egyptian decadence must submit to foreign conquest. Before many years had passed, his son king Merneptah found he had a still more formidable coalition of foreign foes to meet. For sometime Libyan tribes had been occupying the western Delta. Now they are backed by a strong alliance in which the Lycians appear as before. The Shardina, to be identified with Sardinians, who had been mercenaries of Ramses II, are now opposed to the Egyptians, and with them come Tursha, who are held to be Etruscans, and Akaiwasha, Greek Achaeans. If the Shakalsha, of the fourteenth century were men of Sagalassus, unless there

¹ Herod. I, 56.

² Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, III, p. 241.

had meantime been some western migration, it is difficult to identify them with the *Sikels* of Sicily. See further, chap. XII.

To the incursions of these mysterious sea-folk we probably owe it that some of the names of peoples which are known to us in early times have in later days ceased to be familiar. In the mountainous country of south-west Asia Minor it would not be surprising if there were relics of several races which had succeeded one another, each newcomer in turn subdued by a later. The name however of Lycia is old, and Egyptian scholars argue that in the Ruku of Egyptian monuments are to be found the ancient Lycians who, along with other sea-folk, had fought against the Egyptians and been taken captive. But even so, Herodotus recognized a still more ancient name of the country in Milyas, and earlier inhabitants in the Solymi and Termilai or Tremilai¹. These tribes were regarded as being extremely ancient, for to Bellerophon was ascribed the change of the name of Tremilai into Lycians. Yet even in the time of Herodotus the name Termilai was still familiar. In the later population scholars are inclined to see a stock that had migrated from the island of Crete, which the poet of the *Odyssey*, or his interpolator, recognized as a land of ninety cities in which were many peoples and among them the Pelasgoi². Wild as this corner of Asia is, it has preserved more records, in the form of non-Greek inscriptions, than any other district as yet of the western littoral of Asia Minor. But though the inscriptions are numerous, it cannot be said that they throw light upon the origins of the language, which, after discussions protracted over many years, cannot certainly be referred to any of the known families of language. In many respects the Lycian customs resembled those of the Carians, but in one they were conspicuously different. The Lycians counted kin through the mother, legitimatized the offspring of the union between a woman who was a citizen and a slave, and deprived of rights the children of a male citizen and a slave woman³.

Their next neighbours, the Carians, were somewhat more fortunate, for in them were recognized by the ancients—and their statement is not disputed by the moderns—a population extending over many of the islands which in later times were Greek, and believed at one time to have occupied the mainland of Greece itself. In the days of Thucydides graves opened by the Athenians for the purification of the island of Delos showed, according to the historian, skeletons of which more than half were recognized by the armour buried with them and by the form of burial as

¹ I, 173; cf. p. 282 below. ² *Odyssey*, XIX, 175 sqq. ³ Herod. I, 173.

being Carians¹. Whatever its origin, this also was a fighting stock which supplied mercenaries to Asiatic and Egyptian potentates, and most of the little that we know of the Carian language is drawn from the names scratched in an idle hour upon monuments on the banks of the upper Nile. In Caria also there seems to have been a mixture of populations. The people of Caunus, in the eyes of Herodotus, were natives of the soil, while, according to him, the Carians came to the mainland from the islands. There, in the time of Minos, they were called Leleges and lived free of tribute, having no duty but to man his ships when Minos called upon them so to do². The people of Caunus also claimed, like the Lycians, that they came from Crete. But this is hardly likely if, as says the historian, who himself came from the Carian coast, their customs differed from those of every other people.

The relation between Leleges and Carians is no less difficult (see below, p. 27). According to Herodotus, Leleges was but an old name of the Carians by which they were called when they occupied the islands³. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that Philip of Theangela, himself a native of Caria, was right in declaring that the Leleges stood in the same relation to the Carians as the Helots to their Lacedaemonian masters and the Penestae to their Thessalian overlords⁴. In spite of the lateness of the authority, it seems not at all unlikely that in Caria as in Greece there was an early population reduced to serfdom by later incomers. With the Carians Herodotus classes the Lydians and Mysians, assuring us that they had a common worship at the temple of the Carian Zeus at Mylasa in Caria; Lydus and Mysus, the eponymous heroes of the Lydians and the Mysians, being brothers of Car, the founder of the Carians. Even Strabo, who agrees with Herodotus that the Carians, when they were subjects of Minos in the islands, were called Leleges, admits that when they occupied the mainland of Asia they took from Leleges and Pelasgoi mainly the lands which they held henceforth⁵.

More important for the part they played in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. were the Lydians. In Homer, however, the name of the Lydians is entirely unknown, their place being taken by the Maeonians⁶. Homer links Maeonia with Phrygia and in a simile of the *Iliad* speaks of the Maeonian or Carian woman staining ivory with red to be the cheek-piece of a bridle⁷. In the tenth book of the *Iliad* Lycians, Mysians, Phrygians and

¹ Thuc. I, 8, 1.

² Herod. I, 171.

³ Herod. I, 171.

⁴ Athenaeus, VI, 271 b (F.H.G. IV, 475).

⁵ Strabo, XIV, 27, p. 661.

⁶ *Iliad*, III, 401.

⁷ *Iliad*, IV, 142.

Maeonians are encamped together¹. Unfortunately the results of the American excavations at Sardes, so far as yet published, have not thrown so much light as was expected upon the history of the Lydians. But here, as elsewhere on this coast, it may be conjectured that the Maeonians were an earlier people subdued and ultimately assimilated by the Lydians. Some Maeonians, however, were still important enough to be distinguished in Xerxes' army from the Lydians. Their military equipment was like that of the Cilicians. Pliny says that there were still Maeonians at the foot of Tmolus on the river Cogamus at no great distance from Sardes, which was their legal centre². Whence the Lydians may have come cannot as yet be determined. The country was one to tempt the invader, for, besides the richness of the long river valley, gold dust was obtained from Mount Tmolus. Herodotus could discover little in the customs of the people to distinguish them from the Greeks, except for one curious practice of the common people, among whom daughters earned their own dowries as courtesans. He regards the people as extremely enterprising, the first to coin gold and silver and the first to engage in merchandise³. They were of an inventive turn of mind, for to them Herodotus assigns the discovery of all games except draughts.

Most important of all his statements regarding them is his circumstantial account of their colonization of Etruria. No statement in Herodotus has been perhaps more hotly disputed. But after long discussion no other view, to say the least, appears more plausible. From the inscriptions already published from Sardes it is impossible to say that Lydian and Etruscan are very closely related, though they have undoubtedly a superficial resemblance. Here we must wait for further information. But there is one point of resemblance which has been but little noticed. The Lydians, it is well known, had a great passion for jewellery. From the plates in the British Museum Catalogue of Ancient Jewellery it is very clear that there was an intimate relation between the jewellery of Ionia, influenced by Lydia, and the jewellery of Etruria. Both are characterized by figures of lions and a lion-taming goddess and the frequent use of the Sphinx and of female heads probably representing a goddess⁴. A further item is added to the complexity of the problem by the bas-relief found in Lemnos and first published in 1886, which shows a striking bust of a

¹ *Iliad*, x, 430 sq.

² Herod. vii, 74, 77; Pliny, *N.H.* v, 111, where they are called Maeonii, not Maeones.

³ Herod. i, 93 sq.

⁴ See F. H. Marshall, Introduction to *B.M. Catalogue*, p. xxv sq.

warrior holding a spear with a leaf-shaped head. Two inscriptions in an unknown tongue are written alongside in an archaic form of the Greek alphabet. Here, again, the language, though unknown, has a still more striking resemblance to Etruscan. Till more light can be obtained upon this perplexing problem we may adhere to the belief that the Lydians, the Etruscans, and the authors of these remarkable Lemnian inscriptions were part of the 'Peoples of the Sea' whom the Greeks vaguely called Pelasgoi, and we may believe that in Lydia and in Etruria they established themselves on great mainland territories, possibly from an island home. The detailed investigation of these facts is a matter rather for Comparative Philology than for History, and till greater agreement among authorities is attained it would be idle to draw serious historical conclusions from them. See also p. 282.

The most northerly position amongst the peoples of the western littoral of Asia Minor was occupied by the Mysians, who, according to the ancient writers, were of Thracian descent, and were connected with the inhabitants of the district on the south of the Danube known in later times as Moesia¹. Here, however, there can be little doubt that there was an earlier substratum of population and possibly more than one. To this earlier population must be ascribed the worship which was common to Mysians, Lydians and Carians². In Mysia was the Troad, the most famous area in the earliest literature of Europe, with its renowned city of Ilios and its two famous sieges, the second of which attained to greater lustre possibly merely from the fact that it was the theme of one of the greatest of poets.

III. INDO-EUROPEANS; CONTACT WITH EUROPE

With the access to the Dardanelles we pass into a new area the connections of which are more with Europe than with Asia, for across this narrow strait of the Hellespont, even more than by the waters of the Golden Horn, the teeming populations of Thrace passed into Asia from Europe. Not once nor twice but many times a succession of waves of population flowed over this northern land. The mountain ranges are parallel to the sea coast, and by a long valley which runs up through Paphlagonia to the Halys have passed through all ages the armies which have made or marred the fate of Asiatic empires. We must think of these waves as following one another, each helping to propel still farther eastwards the wave that preceded it. One of the earliest, though probably not the first, of these waves has only lately become known to us.

¹ Strabo, XII, 566, 542.

² Herod. I, 171.

In 1907 were first published from the German discoveries at Boghaz Keui the names of the Indian deities Mitra, Varuna, Indra and the heavenly twins, the Nāsatyas. The records belong to about the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C., and, in spite of the difficulties of the cuneiform syllabary, there could be no doubt that here were names well known in Indian mythology, though at a distance of some two thousand five hundred miles from the nearest point of India. Since then numerals and other words have been discovered of the same origin. It is noticeable that the words are not, as might be expected, in the Iranian forms, which in later times are distinguished from the Indian forms by well-marked phonetic differences¹. There is no probability that we have at this early date the records of Indian princes carrying their conquests so far afield. The only feasible conclusion is that here we have, in the fourteenth century B.C., the records of the Aryan people not yet differentiated into Iranians and Indians, who at a later period formed these two important Indo-European stocks. Much is still uncertain with regard to many of the records discovered at Boghaz Keui, but this at all events is beyond dispute, that, amongst the peoples who for a time centred around this ancient Hittite capital, were some speaking languages containing a strong Indo-European element in their vocabulary, the surest proof that Indo-European and other peoples had been in close contact. The course of their wanderings we do not know as yet, but close upon them must have followed the people now known to us as the Armenians, who, in the time of Herodotus, as now, were seated upon the upper waters of the Euphrates, and were the subject population of an alien empire even as they are to-day, although the alien empire in the fifth century B.C. was that of the great Darius of Persia. To Herodotus the Armenians are an off-shoot from the Phrygians.

There is no reason to doubt the statement of Herodotus that the Phrygians were an European stock which had passed into Asia from the Macedonian area in which they had been known to their neighbours as Briges². In the ancient Phrygian language we have two series of inscriptions: the earlier dating from about

¹ This fact is well illustrated by the numerals discovered; the form for 1 is *aika-* in a compound, for 7 *satta-*. For these the Iranian forms are *aiva-* in Old Persian, *aēva-* in the Avesta, but the Sanskrit is *eka-*; in Iranian *hapta*, in Sanskrit *sapta*, *satta* only in the later descendants of Sanskrit like Prakrit. These Hittite forms are given by P. Jensen in *S.B. der preussischen Akademie*, 1919, pp. 367 sqq.; E. Forrer, *Z.D.M.G.* 1922, pp. 254 sqq. See below, pp. 253, 259.

² Herod. vii, 73.

the sixth century B.C.; the later and more numerous being the tomb-inscriptions of the Roman period. From Armenia comes a rich literature beginning in the fifth century A.D. The language, long supposed to be an off-shoot of Iranian, was demonstrated in 1875 to be an independent branch of the Indo-European stock¹. To one and the same section belong all the peoples of this family which have been already mentioned. They are distinguished from the stocks of the same origin in western Europe by their treatment of certain original guttural consonants which these languages convert into some form of sibilant, while in Europe they remain guttural sounds. The Phrygian invasion of Asia must have been a very important one, and Phrygia in the hey-day of its power occupied a large part of the interior of Asia Minor, including that which in historical times was ultimately occupied by Gauls and named Galatia.

Of the Paphlagonians, the peoples situated to the north of Phrygia, we know little. Their name was familiar to the Greeks from Homer downwards. In the catalogue of the ships we are told that 'they were led by the shaggy heart of Pylaemenes from the Enetoi, whence is the race of wild mules.' They were famous for their horses and horse-breeding, but the most interesting point is the reference to the name of the Enetoi, to which the ancients found a counterpart in the Veneti on the banks of the Po in northern Italy. By Strabo's time the Enetoi in Asia had entirely disappeared, though even this was disputed, and Zenodotus identified Enete, which he read in the text of Homer, with the town of Amisus (Samsun). Others accounted for their disappearance as due to the loss of Pylaemenes in the Trojan war, which led to their migration to Thrace after the destruction of Troy and to their further migration to the north of Italy². Among Athenians the Paphlagonians had an ill reputation as slaves. This character is probably to be interpreted as arising from the attitude of men who did not bow easily to the yoke. According to Strabo their eastern boundary was the Halys, and they appear to be distinct from the 'White Syrians' or Hittites who lived beyond it. To the west of them were situated tribes, the Caucones and the Mariandyni, who were soon absorbed by their neighbours. In the Persian army the Mariandyni were armed like the Paphlagonians, as were also the Ligyes (otherwise unknown here) and the Matieni. Though Herodotus more than once describes the Matieni as lying beyond the Armenians who border on Cappadocia, their historical existence has long been a puzzle.

¹ H. Hübschmann, *Z. f. vergl. Sprachforschung*, xxi, 5-49.

² Strabo, xii, p. 543; vii, p. 318.

Regarding the earlier history of the Medes, however, the documents of Boghaz Keui apparently afford a clue. Amongst the eight peoples of whom the records are found in the great library unearthed at Boghaz Keui between 1905 and 1907, there appears one named Manda¹, which is identified with the people of the same name who had come into notice as early as the time of Narām-Sin (2750-2700 B.C.); seven hundred years later as Mada; in the second millennium B.C. the name appears several times as Manda; in Assyrian inscriptions of the first millennium B.C. first and rarely as Amadai and Matai and then frequently as Madai. At the beginning of the first millennium B.C. a branch of the same people, as we learn from the Assyrian documents, is found settled near Lake Urmia. The oldest form of the name in Greek is preserved in the Cyprian Madoi. In the Boghaz Keui documents we are told that one branch of this people had neither tilled nor reaped their land, but that a king of the Hatti (Hittites) had made of them vassals and compelled them to be tillers of the soil, thus converting shepherds into husbandmen. From this we may conclude that the Medes, as they are shown to be, must have been one of the earliest waves of the Indo-European speaking peoples or Wiros who crossed into Asia (see pp. 23, 28). The fact that they came into Mesopotamia from the north is no proof that they did not cross Asia Minor in the first instance as so many of their successors did. It is not improbable that this was the source from which the mixed languages found at Boghaz Keui obtained their Indo-European elements.

The boundaries of Cappadocia seem to have varied greatly at different times. The wave of Phrygian invasion, which must have been one of the largest, cut off Cappadocia from western Asia Minor; but through Cataonia and Lycaonia it was able to maintain its connection with Cilicia². Though the most famous Hittite sites, Euyuk and Boghaz Keui, were within the bend of the Halys, Hittite remains are more numerous between the Halys and the Taurus. An important road led from their capital at Boghaz Keui to Caesarea Mazaca, whence a branch passed through Tyana and the Cilician Gates to Tarsus and the sea. The population of the mountainous part of Cilicia seems to have been originally of the same stock as the Hittites. In this area, about 1200 B.C., developed the second Hittite empire with Tyana as its capital,

¹ E. Forrer, *Z.D.M.G.* 1922, pp. 248 sqq.

² The language of Lycaonia is still obscure; Calder, *J.H.S.* 1911, p. 188 sq.; Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament* (1915), chap. v.

when the ancient power at Boghaz Keur had been overthrown by a confederation of tribes who carried their conquest into Syria and even threatened Egypt¹. When the Hittite empire failed, the Phrygian power, represented to the modern world by the legend and the monument of Midas, took its place as the controlling force in the centre of Asia Minor, until in its turn it was overthrown by the kings of Lydia, the last of whom, Croesus, succumbed to the Persians under Cyrus in 546 B.C.

As the Hittite stock seems to represent the native population of Asia, as distinguished from the 'Peoples of the Sea,' and other later incomers, it is probable that the original population of the mountainous districts of Isauria, Pisidia and possibly Milyas in Lycia (whose inhabitants were identified with the Solymi) represent the same stock. The territory lying between the sea and Pisidia was, as its name Pamphylia implies, tenanted by a mixture of peoples who, as on all the low-lying coasts of Asia Minor, had pushed their way in from outside. Unlike most areas upon the Asiatic coast, Pamphylia was unable to maintain Greek with any purity; consequently of all Greek dialects Pamphylian is the most modified by its surroundings. If, however, there is any truth in the theory that the endings in *-ssos* and *-nda* are Carian, since they have been found on European as well as Asiatic territory, there must have been a great influx of Carians into Pisidia, for of the thirteen towns given by Strabo as Pisidian six have the ending *-ssos*, the most important being Sagalassos and Termessos (see also pp. 282, 556). Sinda represents the other ending, and Adada, Tymbriada and Amblada may also be akin. Strabo himself recognizes implicitly such a possibility when he states that they bordered on Phrygians, Lydians and Carians, who, he quaintly says, are 'all peaceful peoples though exposed to the north wind,' while the Romans discovered, to their cost, that the Isaurians and Pisidians were much otherwise, and the Pamphylians, having a great share of Cilician blood amongst them, found it difficult to relinquish piracy². Here once more appear the Leleges, 'wanderers,' says Strabo, 'and remaining here through similarity of character.'

In the *Odyssey* the poet has heard of a mysterious people called the Cimmerians, who live on the threshold of the underworld wrapt in mist and clouds, and the sun never looks down upon them with his rays either at morn or eventide, but deadly night

¹ Sayce, *J.R.A.S.* 1922, pp. 569 *sqq.* See below, pp. 174, 283.

² Strabo, XII, p. 570.

is over all¹. The people whose name was thus first made known to literature lived on the north side of the Black Sea in and about the Crimean peninsula. At the end of the eighth century B.C. or the beginning of the seventh these Cimmerians were driven from their ancient seats by an invasion of the Skolot-Scythians, who seem to have been mainly of Iranian stock. As a result, the Cimmerians moved first to the eastward and then found their way through the central pass of the Caucasus. The Scythians followed in their wake, but at the Caucasus they seem to have missed them; going farther eastwards, and passing through the Caspian Gates, they arrived in Azerbaijan and Media. The events that followed will be treated in the chapter on the Scythians in vol. III.

It is often dangerous to rely upon similarity of name; but the number of identical forms in Asia Minor and in the Balkan peninsula is too great to be the product of mere accident, and in some cases, as that of the Enetoi and the Veneti, the ancients themselves were concerned to explain the coincidence. But besides that instance, and the case of the Mysians in the Troad and the Moesians on the Danube, there were also the Dardania in Mysia from which Priam drew many of his forces, and Dardania at the western end of Mount Haemus. The name has been related by some authorities to the Albanian word for farmer, *dardhan*, which is itself a derivative from *dardhe*, the pear tree. The tradition of the arrival of the Paeonians in Asia is recorded by Herodotus in one of his most picturesque passages and their return to Europe in another not less so².

The contact with Thrace had begun early, for Homer represents Priam as the head of an alliance of tribes combined in defence of Troy but drawn from Europe as well as from Asia. The later settlement of the Thynoi and Bithynoi, whether it arose in connection with the Treres or not, was but the continuation of an older practice. These tribes were able to remain between the river Parthenius and the sea of Marmara because the course of the invasion of Asia Minor now took another turn.

Two peoples who played a large part in Asia came in last, the Greeks and much later the Gauls. It is clear that the coming of the Greeks into Asia did not take place along the whole of the western coast of Asia at the same period. There is little doubt that the earliest stage was the migration of the Aeolians of northern Greece. Here legend seems to correspond well with what might be expected to be fact. From Iolcus went forth the expedition of Jason, which in itself was nothing at all surprising,

¹ XI, 14.

² Herod. v, 12, 16; v, 98.

and is merely the story of early adventurers at sea, garnished with the myths of the Clashing Islands (Symplegades), and of the Golden Fleece, and the magic of Medea in Colchis. From the northern area also came some of the most important chiefs of the two expeditions at Troy, Peleus against Laomedon, Achilles against Priam. The Pagasæan Gulf is a natural starting-point for sea-rovers, and by Scyros, Imbros and Lemnos it was easy to descend upon the Asiatic coast. Later came the invasion of the Ionians of Attica, and especially of the Peloponnese, into the parts about Miletus and Ephesus. Much earlier than these, it may be conjectured, while the Arcadian stock had easy access to the sea, a colony set forth to Cyprus which continued, down even to the fourth century B.C., to write Greek in an Asiatic syllabary (vol. 1, p. 144). This island, far to the east, clearly lost touch, to a large extent, with the homeland of Greece and, surrounded by an indigenous and also a Phoenician population, preserved its language, as such colonies do, in a more primitive form than survived in its native country. Later still came the Dorians into Crete and into the south-western corner of the Asiatic coast (see chap. xix).

The most energetic of those peoples were the Ionians of Miletus. Their colonies, established solely in the interest of their trade, extended on the one side into the Black Sea and on the other into the Delta of the Nile. Their influence spread north and south over their neighbours, so that Smyrna ceased to be Aeolian and Halicarnassus ceased to be Dorian. The Greeks have always been a seafaring and not an inland people, and hence it came about that the area occupied by Greeks at the end of the nineteenth century A.D. was much the same as they were occupying in the eighth century B.C.

The Gaulish tribes repeat in the full light of history what many other tribes must have done before history begins. Their earlier connections are set forth in the following chapter. They did not reach Asia till 278 B.C. Their opportunity arose from family disputes amongst the princes on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont and the Bosphorus. They were in three divisions, the Tolistobogii, the Trocmi and the Tectosages¹. The princes of Asia regarded their raids with awe and horror, but every one of them was prepared to employ Gaulish mercenaries as fighters against some town or tribe which had incurred his enmity. After wandering to and fro for some time as raiders, these Gauls firmly established themselves in part of the great area which had once been Phrygia. They very soon adopted the worship of the Earth goddess, the

¹ Livy, xxxviii, 16.

most characteristic cult of Asia Minor, a fetish stone of which was brought from Pessinus to Rome in 204 B.C. With the cult they adopted the foul rites which belonged to it, so that to later times the emasculated priests of the Great Mother were known as Gauls (*Galli*).

With the kings of Pergamum the Gauls were never at peace, because the kings of Pergamum were not strong enough by themselves to reduce them to order. In the early part of the second century B.C. the Romans came into Asia and with their coming the doom of the Galatae was sealed.

CHAPTER II

THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

GEOGRAPHICALLY Europe is but a large peninsula of Asia. Its features in all respects are on a smaller scale than those of the great continent to which it is attached. There is no clear boundary line between Europe and Asia. As we have already seen, the Greek islands are but stepping stones forming an easy passage across the Aegean. The Dardanelles and the Bosphorus are channels in which a rapid current flows, but which are exceeded in breadth by many river estuaries. The Ural Mountains, which, manuals of geography tell us, are the main boundary between the two continents, are of comparatively small elevation and have never been an effectual boundary preventing passage to and fro between Asia and Europe. The most formidable barrier is formed by the great wall of the Caucasus between the Black Sea and the Caspian, through which the pass of Dariel alone supplies a passage between Europe and Asia other than that supplied by the shore of the Caspian.

The greatest variations in recent geological times on the eastern side of Europe are the elevation of the Ural Mountains, the contraction in area of the Caspian, the sinking of the region now covered by the northern Aegean, so that the islands are all that remain of its ancient hill tops, and the river which once flowed into the sea near the island of Andros has been curtailed to form the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmara and the Dardanelles. To the same period of geological time belongs the gradual filling up of the wide estuary of the Po by the silt brought down by its own waters from the Alps.

The greatest line of division in Europe is that formed by the mountain chains which run across it in an irregular line from west to east, the Pyrenees, the Cevennes, the Jura, the Alps and the Carpathians, of which the latter, like a great point of interrogation, form a boundary between the plains of Hungary and the wide expanses of Thrace and the steppes of Russia that lie beyond. To the south-east of the main range of the Alps runs the long line formed by the Julian Alps, the Dinaric Alps and the Balkans, continued in rough and mountainous country to the

three peninsulas, in which the kingdom of Greece ends to the southward. To the north of the Alps runs north-west and south-east the Bohemian Forest, at right angles to which stretch the Erz-Gebirge. With this range are connected the Riesen-Gebirge running south-eastwards and separated only from the Tatra, the northern heights of the Carpathians, by the wide pass known as the Moravian Gate. In the far north is the Scandinavian peninsula with much the greatest part of its extent extremely mountainous. Mountains of considerable height are found also in the north of Scotland; but through England, northern France, northern Germany and Russia there runs a great plain which continues unbroken to the Ural Mountains.

As has been shown more fully in vol. 1, chaps. 1 and 11, a very long record of human habitation is perpetuated before history begins. The roughest of chipped stone weapons (eoliths), so rough that it has been demonstrated that similar products could also be created by natural causes, are assigned to the action of the earliest men; and others, somewhat more advanced, are undoubtedly the handiwork of men who take their name from these weapons as palaeolithic men, or men of the palaeolithic age. To men from the end of this period are assigned various attempts at representing the forms of animals and also human beings, which are found in many places, but particularly in the south of France and in Spain and Portugal. The men of that age were good draughtsmen, as these extant figures show. They had also considerable skill in carving, as is proved by their carvings, mainly on bone and ivory of such animals as the mammoth, the bison and the horse. After them there came for northern Europe the change of climate which produced the 'Great Ice Age,' in which more than once the severity of the climate seems to have lessened and the ice to have retreated. At the last period of its greatest extent southwards the ice stopped short of the Thames in Britain and extended to about the latitude of Berlin on the Continent. After a period of unknown length the ice gradually retreated to its present limits, but a long time must have elapsed before a numerous population could have maintained itself upon the lands which had been left bare by the retreating ice. See more particularly, vol. 1, p. 45 sq.

The conditions of northern Europe must for long have been somewhat like those of northern Siberia now. The first stage of vegetation would be marked by the growth of grass and shallow-rooting plants, followed by water-loving trees, like the willow, the alder and the birch. But for a long period deep-rooting shrubs

CHAPTER II

THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

GEOGRAPHICALLY Europe is but a large peninsula of Asia. Its features in all respects are on a smaller scale than those of the great continent to which it is attached. There is no clear boundary line between Europe and Asia. As we have already seen, the Greek islands are but stepping stones forming an easy passage across the Aegean. The Dardanelles and the Bosphorus are channels in which a rapid current flows, but which are exceeded in breadth by many river estuaries. The Ural Mountains, which, manuals of geography tell us, are the main boundary between the two continents, are of comparatively small elevation and have never been an effectual boundary preventing passage to and fro between Asia and Europe. The most formidable barrier is formed by the great wall of the Caucasus between the Black Sea and the Caspian, through which the pass of Dariel alone supplies a passage between Europe and Asia other than that supplied by the shore of the Caspian.

The greatest variations in recent geological times on the eastern side of Europe are the elevation of the Ural Mountains, the contraction in area of the Caspian, the sinking of the region now covered by the northern Aegean, so that the islands are all that remain of its ancient hill tops, and the river which once flowed into the sea near the island of Andros has been curtailed to form the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmara and the Dardanelles. To the same period of geological time belongs the gradual filling up of the wide estuary of the Po by the silt brought down by its own waters from the Alps.

The greatest line of division in Europe is that formed by the mountain chains which run across it in an irregular line from west to east, the Pyrenees, the Cevennes, the Jura, the Alps and the Carpathians, of which the latter, like a great point of interrogation, form a boundary between the plains of Hungary and the wide expanses of Thrace and the steppes of Russia that lie beyond. To the south-east of the main range of the Alps runs the long line formed by the Julian Alps, the Dinaric Alps and the Balkans, continued in rough and mountainous country to the

three peninsulas, in which the kingdom of Greece ends to the southward. To the north of the Alps runs north-west and south-east the Bohemian Forest, at right angles to which stretch the Erz-Gebirge. With this range are connected the Riesen-Gebirge running south-eastwards and separated only from the Tatra, the northern heights of the Carpathians, by the wide pass known as the Moravian Gate. In the far north is the Scandinavian peninsula with much the greatest part of its extent extremely mountainous. Mountains of considerable height are found also in the north of Scotland; but through England, northern France, northern Germany and Russia there runs a great plain which continues unbroken to the Ural Mountains.

As has been shown more fully in vol. 1, chaps. 1 and 11, a very long record of human habitation is perpetuated before history begins. The roughest of chipped stone weapons (eoliths), so rough that it has been demonstrated that similar products could also be created by natural causes, are assigned to the action of the earliest men; and others, somewhat more advanced, are undoubtedly the handiwork of men who take their name from these weapons as palaeolithic men, or men of the palaeolithic age. To men from the end of this period are assigned various attempts at representing the forms of animals and also human beings, which are found in many places, but particularly in the south of France and in Spain and Portugal. The men of that age were good draughtsmen, as these extant figures show. They had also considerable skill in carving, as is proved by their carvings, mainly on bone and ivory of such animals as the mammoth, the bison and the horse. After them there came for northern Europe the change of climate which produced the 'Great Ice Age,' in which more than once the severity of the climate seems to have lessened and the ice to have retreated. At the last period of its greatest extent southwards the ice stopped short of the Thames in Britain and extended to about the latitude of Berlin on the Continent. After a period of unknown length the ice gradually retreated to its present limits, but a long time must have elapsed before a numerous population could have maintained itself upon the lands which had been left bare by the retreating ice. See more particularly, vol. 1, p. 45 sq.

The conditions of northern Europe must for long have been somewhat like those of northern Siberia now. The first stage of vegetation would be marked by the growth of grass and shallow-rooting plants, followed by water-loving trees, like the willow, the alder and the birch. But for a long period deep-rooting shrubs

and trees would not have been able to maintain themselves, because, long after the ice on the surface had disappeared, the ground would have remained frozen at a considerable depth. With the gradual disappearance of this underground ice and the increase of vegetation came also a variety of birds and quadrupeds as well as many lower forms of animal life. What elements of the ancient palaeolithic population followed the ice northwards need not be discussed. The new men developed gradually much greater skill in the manufacture of stone axes, chisels and arrowheads; but they had not the same artistic powers in draughtsmanship and carving.

Anthropologists classify the types of man which have existed in Europe since neolithic times in three great classes if we disregard the more detailed subdivisions. These are: (1) 'Nordic' man, the dolichocephalic, tall, fair-skinned, fair-haired and blue or grey-eyed inhabitant of the north. (2) 'Mediterranean' man, also dolichocephalic, but differing from the Nordic by darker hair, eyes and skin, and shorter and slighter figure. On the western side of Europe the Nordic and the Mediterranean race touch and overlap. Mediterranean man is found, as the name implies, mainly along the Mediterranean, but reaching northwards into Switzerland and south Germany, and to some extent into England and extending eastwards through southern Russia towards the Black Sea. (3) 'Alpine' man, brachycephalic, the cranium rising high above the ears, with a broad face, eyes often grey, and hair brown, generally of medium height and stoutly built. This type is found through the greater part of central Europe, from Russia to the Atlantic.

From a very early period all kinds of mixtures have taken place among these types, and in many parts of Europe they are inextricably intermingled. Of the peoples of Europe we really learn most from the linguistic records which have been preserved from the ninth century B.C. downwards. From these, however, we ordinarily gather nothing of the physical characteristics of the writers or the people they describe; and when it occurs to them to describe physical appearance the language is frequently too vague to give us much assistance. Much has been written about the description of Menelaus in Homer as yellow-haired, as the word *ξανθός* is frequently translated. In modern Greek, however, the word is used practically of any colour of hair short of jet black, and the colour was in all probability not lighter than auburn, for the verb *ξανθίζειν* is used by Aristophanes of the colour of meat in the process of browning. When the Greeks

came into contact with real blond hair, as we can see from Diodorus, they were puzzled how to describe it, and state that the children on the Belgian coast had the hair of old men, applying to them the adjective ordinarily used for the white locks of age (*πολιός*)¹. In Europe, through all the period which history covers, the greater part of the population has spoken languages belonging to the Indo-European family. But it hardly needs to be pointed out that there is no necessary relation between the physical characteristics of the speaker and the language which he speaks. From very early times it is probable that persons of all three racial types spoke Indo-European languages, and it is important to have a word which can be applied to speakers of the languages without any implication of race. For this, the simplest means is to designate them by a word which in most of the Indo-European languages indicates men—*Wiros*.

For ancient times our knowledge of the peoples of Europe is derived entirely from Greek and Roman writers who, whatever their own racial origin, used languages which were Indo-European. But besides the *Wiros* there were, in early times, and indeed to some extent still are, speakers of other languages in Europe. The most archaic of these languages still surviving is Basque, which is spoken in valleys on both sides of the Pyrenees. The speakers are partly short and dark and partly tall and fair, from which it has been argued that the short and dark represent the ancient race, and the tall and fair remnants of the Visigoths who invaded Spain in the fifth century A.D. The language has no close relations with any other language in Europe. Whether it had any connection with the language of the ancient Iberian inscriptions, or whether the Iberians were related to the Berbers are still matters of dispute.

A second language which has disappeared is that of the Ligurians, whose habitat was said to be in the mountains above the gulf of Genoa, but of whom many modern writers have discovered traces over a far wider area in Gaul, Spain and Italy. Of the Ligurians we know very little. They lived like the Celts, but were of a different stock². The few inscriptions attributed to them are probably Celtic, and the statements of the ancients that they were a thin, wiry people, winning a hard living from a barren soil by agriculture in which their women did much of the work, is a description that would apply to most highland peoples from that day to this³.

A people who made a greater figure in the ancient world, but

¹ Diodorus, v, 32.

² Strabo, II, 28, p. 128.

³ Diodorus, IV, 20.

whose language and characteristics have equally disappeared as separate entities, were the Etruscans. They will come up for discussion in vol. III. Meanwhile it may be said that they occupied the western coast of Italy from the Tiber northwards and extended, at one time, to the Alps; though, in the fifth century B.C., when their power was broken, they were driven back on the north-east by the Gauls who at that time had invaded and occupied the valley of the Po. The racial and the linguistic relations of the Etruscan people are equally mysterious. It is certain that the ancients were right in believing that they were a people alien to Italy who had reached its shores by sea. The numerous representations of them in their own art, which was clearly learned by them from the Greeks, shows that they were not of the same type as the ordinary inhabitant of Italy at the period to which the monuments belong. Though more than eight thousand inscriptions exist in the language and though in 1892 a book in Etruscan, which had long lain in an Egyptian mummy case, was published, the relations of the language remain almost as obscure as they were before. Whether, as the ancients supposed¹, the Etruscans had migrated from Lydia must still remain undecided, although in the preceding chapter some reason has been shown for a connection between Etruria and Lydia and the mysterious bas-relief discovered in the island of Lemnos. See pp. 11 *sq.*, 282.

The Sicani, early inhabitants of Sicily, were connected by the ancients with the Iberians. The language of the ancient Siculi, from whom the island derived its name, was, from its scanty remains, obviously closely related to Latin. In the heel of Italy another language, the Messapian, was spoken. Of this a certain number of genuine inscriptions survive, mixed up with many others forged by stone-masons at the end of the 'sixties' in order to win the rewards offered by an incautious antiquary for the discovery of such inscriptions. The language appears to have been connected with the ancient Illyrian, and the speakers may have themselves migrated from Illyria, as Albanians did migrate to Italy in the sixteenth century A.D., and in a few communities in southern Italy still preserve their ancient language. At the northern end of the eastern side of Italy are found inscriptions of the ancient Veneti, in whom the classical writers saw a tribe who had migrated from Asia Minor to Europe and, traversing the northern continuation of the Pindus Range, had ultimately reached the coast and passed round the head of the Adriatic to the seats which in historical times they occupied². They too were probably

¹ Herod. I, 94; Strabo, v, p. 219.

² Strabo, XIII, p. 608.

connected in reality with stems in northern Illyria as Herodotus supposed and as modern investigation seems to confirm¹.

The relation of the modern Albanian language to the tribes which in classical times occupied the same area is not clear. The difficulties are two-fold. Modern Albanian has been so much influenced by its neighbours, Greek, Latin, Romance, Slavonic and Turkish, that, out of a vocabulary of five thousand words, G. Meyer could identify only four hundred as belonging to the native language. The second difficulty is of a different kind. The Indo-European languages fall into two large groups, according to the treatment of certain original guttural sounds which in one group become some form of sibilant and in the other remain as the gutturals *k*, *g* and *gh*, with subsequent modifications in some cases arising in the separate histories of the individual languages. The group which has kept the gutturals is found, as yet, only in Europe and Chinese Turkestan: Teutonic, Celtic, Latin and other Italic dialects, Greek; Tocharish. The languages which have changed the gutturals into sibilants comprise the ancient languages of this stock in India and Iran—Sanskrit with its numerous descendants in India, and in Persia the language of the Avesta, itself in two dialects, and the language of the ancient inscriptions of the Achaemenid Dynasty between 525 B.C. and 330 B.C., which were written in cuneiform and were first fully deciphered by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1847 and following years.

To the latter group also belongs Armenian, which, like Albanian, has borrowed much from its neighbours. It is known only from the fifth century A.D.; and before then had incorporated much Persian material and itself overlaid a still earlier language. With it was connected ancient Phrygian, found in two series of inscriptions separated by many centuries. The other languages of this group are the Slavonic, known to us first in the ancient ecclesiastical language employed by Greek missionaries from Constantinople in the ninth century A.D., Cyril and Methodius, and later in many other dialects with which must be coupled the Baltic dialects including Lithuanian, Lettish and the extinct Old Prussian. Albanian is a language of this group, but it seems hardly likely that the ancient Messapian and the Venetic agree with it on the gutturals. If not, as this difference is extremely old, we must suppose that modern Albanian is not closely related to these ancient dialects, or to the ancient Illyrian which was presumably closely connected with them. If it is not so related, it can only be explained as a Thracian dialect which had been

¹ Herod. I, 196.

pushed through the extension of the Pindus Range by pressure in its original habitat, for Albania is too mountainous and difficult of access to be an inviting country for colonists. It is, of course, possible that, as in Asia Minor, there may have been from the earliest times a difference between the population and the language of the narrow sea-coast with the islands along it and those on the high ground behind, a possibility which receives support from the fact that this distinction of language and also of race has characterized and does still characterize the country in modern times.

The early history of the lands lying between the Adriatic and the Danube is not well known. But in many parts we know that the early population was practically exterminated by the Romans who filled up the vacant spaces by bringing in tribes from elsewhere. Thus Ammianus Marcellinus tells us that the emperor Maximin was by race of the tribe of the Carpi, who were moved by Diocletian from their ancient homes in the High Tatra in the Carpathians into Pannonia¹. Such removals of peoples both voluntary and involuntary had gone on for many centuries. In the middle of the fourth century B.C. certain Celtic tribes, the Scordisci, Taurisci and the Boii, were forcing southwards the Illyrians, who, during the temporary weakness of Macedonia, spread over a considerable part of its western territories, till they were met by the youthful Philip II, and after a hotly-contested battle were driven back beyond Lake Lychnitis. A hundred and thirty years later they came in contact with the Roman power which was beginning to stretch across the Adriatic, and, after many wars, were finally reduced under Roman sway, although they remained ready enough to rebel at any suitable opportunity.

One of the most difficult problems of ancient history is to determine who were the earliest inhabitants of Greece. On few subjects has more advance been made in the last fifty years, but it cannot be said that an answer to the problem has been reached with certainty. Of the Pelasgians, who, as has been wittily said, only appear in order to disappear, some account has been given in the previous chapter (p. 12, see also pp. 488, 544). In the view of the Greeks themselves the oldest of their tribes was the Leleges, whom Hesiod, as quoted by Strabo, said that Zeus had granted as picked peoples from the earth to Deucalion². But the poet was only exercising his ingenuity in inventing a double pun by connecting the adjective *λεκτός*, 'picked,' with the name of the Leleges, and the word for stone with the word for people, which differed only

¹ Ammian. Mar. xxviii, i, 5.

² Strabo, vii, p. 321.

by an accent (~~λαός~~, λαός). In the Greek view the Leleges came from the north-west, through Greece and the islands, and reached as far as Asia Minor. Their eponymous hero, Lelex, is said by Aristotle to have been a native of Leucadia. The same authority informs us that in Aetolia the modern Locrians were identical with the Leleges and that they spread to Boeotia¹. In later times they were mixed with the Carians and their name disappeared from Greece (see p. 10). In Homer it is clear that the peoples are independent, for the Leleges were encamped separately from the Carians in Priam's army and their king Altes was a father-in-law of Priam and ruled the city of Pedasus. If the identification of Pedasus in Egyptian records could be trusted (p. 281), the Leleges of Homer might be a remnant of a once more powerful people.

In later times, as we have seen, the Carians remained a formidable people, famous as mercenaries, though they too had disappeared from Greek lands and were to be found only in Asia Minor, and though the ancient graves in Delos were recognized by Thucydides as being in part Carian². To the Carians have been assigned certain proper names which are frequent in Greece and have no etymology in the Greek language, particularly the names which end in *-ssos* or *-ttos*, like Mycalessos in Boeotia, the river Ilissos and Mount Hymettos at Athens, a type of name which is very widely spread through Greece and its islands. Another ending of the same kind is *-nthos*, seen in Corinthos and many other proper names, and in some common nouns like ἀσάμνθος ('a bath') and various names of plants and animals. The disappearance of these peoples was owing to the incoming from the north of the Achaeans.

There is no reason to doubt the statement of the ancients that there were Phoenician settlements in Greek lands, the most famous that of Cadmus in Thebes. But the Phoenicians were a trading people who did not establish permanent colonies in Greece, but only stations in which to gather the wares in which they traded (see p. 379). If we may trust Athenaeus, Caria was called Phoenice by Corinna and Bacchylides³.

In the middle of the second millennium B.C. the power which had been growing in Crete over a long period had reached its height. The traditions which survived of it were connected by the Greeks of classical times with the great king Minos, who not only reigned in a magnificent city at Cnossus, but extended his power in many directions over Greek lands, and founded many places known by his name as Minoa. To-day we know

¹ Strabo, vii, p. 322.

² Thuc. i, 8.

³ Ath. iv, 174 sq.

that, in so far as it attached kingly power to Cnossus, tradition spoke truly, but besides Cnossus there were many other important settlements of the same period in Crete and adjacent lands. The excavations of Sir Arthur Evans at Cnossus and of the Italians at Phaestus have revealed to us how strong and how advanced in civilization these Cretan cities were. As we have already seen, many of the peoples of the western coast of Asia Minor who preceded the Greeks professed to have come from Crete (p. 10 *sq.*). But Crete was an island of ninety cities and of many nations¹. Among them were the true Cretans (*Ετεόκρητες*). Some inscriptions found in recent years at Praesus apparently preserve their language, which cannot be certainly identified as Indo-European, though it has some undoubted similarities. According to Herodotus this language survived only in Praesus and Polichne after the forces of Minos had followed him to Sicily². Ethnologists, however, still find in eastern Crete a type which they identify as Eteocretan. Here also were the 'People of the Sea,' the Pelasgians, and, besides, according to Homer, Achaeans, Cydonians, and Dorians with waving hair, if that indeed be the meaning of the epithet *τριχάϊκες*. In the excavations at Cnossus many records in writing have been found, but as yet it is impossible to read them. The art of Cnossus and its contemporary cities shows a people of elegant figure and much grace, but the probability that they are Greeks is certainly less than it was in the view of some excellent scholars when the discoveries were first made. See further, chap. xvi.

The new element in the population that we know as Greek must certainly have descended from the north. Access from the north to Greece is easy, for the valleys run in the main north and south. Tradition brought Thracians even to a religious centre like Eleusis, and in this there is nothing surprising, for to this day, in winter, Thracian shepherds may be met in Attica, having brought their flocks to a country safer from storms than the uplands in which they spend the summer. From what centre these people came we can at present only guess, but there are many arguments in favour of the view that the people whom we have called Wiros, without regard to their racial origin but only to the fact that they spoke Indo-European languages, dispersed from a centre on the Danube which may be roughly outlined as bounded eastwards by the Carpathians, southwards by the Balkans, westwards by the Bohemian Forest and northwards by the mountains

¹ *Odyssey*, xix, 175 *sqq.*

² Herod. vii, 170.

that separate Bohemia from Germany and make a semi-circle ending at the Moravian Gate¹.

Here are found the conditions of climate which the Indo-European languages appear to postulate, and here too are found the beasts and birds and plants for which identical words exist in many of the languages. There is reason to suppose that this people was partly pastoral, partly agricultural, for the plains of Hungary are admirably suited for growing the grain which they knew and for fostering the horses with which they were certainly familiar, while the park-lands of the lower Carpathians were well suited to the maintenance of cattle and the heights for the pasturage of sheep. The quadrupeds with which on linguistic grounds it may be assumed that the Wiros were familiar in their earliest period, were the horse, the cow, the sheep, the pig and the dog. The evidence from this source for the goat is less strong. Words for wheat and barley were known, and those for ploughing, sowing, reaping, and the necessary implements, are widely spread.

The district was a centre from which the Wiros of Europe might most easily spread, and also might easily pass, as they undoubtedly did, in wave after wave to Asia Minor and the East. We can only guess at the causes which led to their spreading over the lands in which we find them when history begins. The most probable is the increase of population beyond the bounds of subsistence. It is impossible to believe that so many languages, with so complicated a grammar, could have developed on so closely similar lines, unless the speakers had spent a long time in contact with one another and shut off from their neighbours, as in the area mentioned they were, by mountains which offer comparatively few means of access. How far their civilization had reached before separation took place is not easy to define precisely. It may be supposed that they were at any rate passing out of the stone age into the bronze age but were not yet familiar with the working of iron.

The earliest settlers of this stock to reach southern Greece were those we know as Arcadians, though in earlier times they were not confined to that mountainous region, but extended to the sea coasts of the Peloponnese from which, greatly daring, they sent out a band of colonists who established themselves at an early period in the island of Cyprus. Here, however, they had always formidable competitors in the Phoenicians, more of whose early records have been found in Cyprus than in Phoenicia itself, and both had to deal with an earlier people. From them these Greeks

¹ See *E. Brit. s. v.* 'Indo-European languages,' and *Gamb. Hist. of India*, I, ch. iii.

at any rate learnt to write in an Asiatic syllabary which, no doubt through instinctive opposition to the Phoenicians with their more modern alphabet, they persisted in writing till the fourth century B.C. (vol. I, p. 144).

In succession to this stock there came along the eastern side of Greece the peoples whom we know in the north as Aeolians. They occupied the country as far as the isthmus of Corinth, except Attica with which was linked the population on the southern side of the Saronic Gulf. The tradition of this close connection between Attica and towns like Troezen, which in the fifth century B.C. were extremely hostile to Athens, is shown in the firm tradition preserved by the Attic tragedians of amity and kinship between the cities in the time of Theseus. Subsequently the Dorians arrived by the valleys of the north-west. From here they spread across southern Thessaly and mingled with the earlier population of Boeotia so far as to produce a curious mongrel dialect. They, too, passed Attica by, probably because its marble rocks presented no attraction to them, and by the isthmus passed into the Peloponnese, where they established themselves in its most fertile lands and on the eastern coast assimilated the Ionians of the Attic stock¹. At a later time the southern side of the Corinthian Gulf and the north-western corner of Elis were occupied by Dorians, who came across the Corinthian Gulf bringing with them the less refined dialect of the Dorian tribes who had lingered in the wilder lands that skirt Parnassus.

Of all Greek regions Thessaly was the wealthiest in natural resources, for, being the bed of an ancient inland sea which was ultimately drained when the Peneus broke through the vale of Tempe to the Aegean, it formed a spacious cornland to which there was no parallel in southern Greece. The conditions of life in Thessaly were such as to develop a feudal aristocracy and a subject population of serfs. Here are readily developed men eager for adventure, and hence it is that the first legend of a voyage into distant and mysterious lands started with Jason from the Pagasæan Gulf. From this country sprang also some of the knights who fought in two great expeditions against Troy, the town which held the entrance of the Dardanelles; Peleus fights against Laomedon, his son Achilles fights against Laomedon's son Priam. If Homer's statement that there were Dorians in Crete is to be trusted, it was by drifting down the Aegean that they reached it, for colonization by Dorians was long posterior to the age of which Homer sang. See pp. 514, 528.

In classical times the mountainous country north of the Gulf

¹ Herod. viii, 73, 3.

of Corinth through which the Dorians had passed was little known to the Greeks, although the most ancient of their shrines, Dodona, was in the heart of it. In later times it was known as Epirus—the mainland—and was flooded by other tribes which came in from the north and were of Illyrian stock. The tribes at the southern end of this area were known as Aetolians, the most important sept of which was the Eurytanes, of whom Thucydides has only to say that their language was extremely unintelligible and that they were cannibals¹.

North-eastwards of Epirus lay Macedonia, the tribes of which were little known to the Greeks until the fifth century B.C., when the ruling family claimed to be of the descendants of Heracles and to be genuine Greeks, a claim which it was the delight of opposing orators of the Athenian assembly to scoff at and reject. Nevertheless, although here also there was, as we have seen, a mixture of peoples through mutual invasion, the language of the Macedonians closely resembled Greek, from which it differed by sound changes not more remarkable than the differences which exist between English dialects. Their civilization had fallen behind that of the tribes which had moved farther to the south, but the stock apparently was the same. The boundaries of the country varied at different times and the outlying areas of Lyncestis on the west and Paeonia on the north were apparently as much Illyrian and Thracian as Macedonian.

Separated from Macedonia by the long ridge of Mount Rhodope, and bounded on the north by the Haemus Range, and extending eastwards to the Dardanelles, the Bosphorus, and the Black Sea, lay Thrace, a country the civilization of which, like that of Macedonia, had fallen behind Greek civilization, but with the population of which in early times Greek tradition claimed close connection. Thence had come more than one worship which had affected Greek civilization not a little, the most important being that of Dionysus, who, when his worship was carried to a warmer country, ceased to be the deity of the liquor brewed from barley and became the wine-god. To Greek poets the great river of Thrace, the Hebrus, with its waters frozen over, was the type of everything that was horrible in climate; but the coasts of Thrace speedily became dotted with Greek colonies which proved an important element in Greek civilization, and one of them,

¹ Thuc. III, 94. The view that they were only 'eaters of pemmican' is refuted by the ordinary meaning of the word *ἑμοφάγος*. That other peoples who were their enemies should say they were cannibals does not prove the statement. A similar charge was made against the Ordovices of North Wales (*Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 1906, p. 5).

Byzantium, was destined to become for a long period the capital of a great empire. Of the Thracian people who were both numerous and powerful the only linguistic remains are proper names and a single inscription discovered some years ago. Its early emigrants, Armenians, Phrygians, Bithynians, etc., have already been treated (see pp. 13 *sqq.*).

Beyond the Haemus, except along the coasts of the Black Sea, everything was dark and mysterious. On the coast, between the end of the Haemus Range and the delta of the Danube, Greek colonies were thickly planted. Beyond, for a long distance they were more rare, but Olbia, at the mouth of the Hypanis, was an important centre. There were others in the Crimea, most important of which were Theudosia, on the north-eastern side, and Panticapaeum (Kertch) at the entrance to the sea of Azov. The general name of this unknown country was Scythia, but naturally its further boundaries were unknown. The manners and customs of the Scythians were of great interest to the Greeks, and both Herodotus and his contemporary, the great physician Hippocrates, devoted careful study to them¹. They were a nomad people who moved from place to place in covered wains, but their men rode on horseback and their territory was believed to extend north of the Caspian and the Aral Sea across the Jaxartes far into Asia. Of their civilization many most valuable remains have been discovered in southern Russia. In all probability their racial history was much like that of the modern Turks, who, by constant interbreeding with white races, have lost their racial characteristics and have practically become a white race themselves. The raiding of the Persian borderlands carried on century after century no doubt produced a similar change in the appearance and physique of the Scythians. Some words which have been preserved of the Scythian language are obviously Iranian, but with the history of the people that we have assumed this is not in the least surprising. See p. 17, and the chapter on the Scythians in vol. III.

The Sarmatians, who are often assumed to be Slavs, were apparently only a branch of the Scythians. The Slavs, who however do not figure in ancient history, seem to have left their original home by the Moravian Gate and for long occupied the country in the neighbourhood of the vast marshes of the Pripiet. Among them are found both short-headed and long-headed representatives. Their distribution in modern times has little relation to that in ancient times. In the Balkan peninsula they have spread much farther to the east, and in the Peloponnese

¹ Herod. iv; Hippocr. *de aere* etc., chaps. 24-30.

they have been absorbed by the Greek-speaking stock. In Germany, where in the seventeenth century A.D. a Slavonic dialect was still spoken farther west than Jutland, the language has yielded to German. The members of this stock, who were the first to reach the Baltic, were no doubt the Lithuanians, Letts and Old Prussians. The language of the Old Prussians became extinct in the seventeenth century. The languages of the Lithuanians and the Letts, which really differ little more than Attic and Aeolic Greek, continue their existence, but are threatened by Polish and by Russian. In Lithuanian there is an active literary movement which, however, is perhaps more in evidence in Chicago than it is in its native country.

From the time that history begins we find a people very active in the valley of the Danube. These are the Celts. Strong of frame, active in mind, vigorous and prolific, throughout the whole course of ancient European history they harassed the more settled parts of Europe and penetrated even into Asia. Their dialects bear a curious resemblance to those of the Italic stock—the Oscan and Umbrian and many minor dialects, on one side, and the Latin and Faliscan, upon the other—in that they fall into two groups, according as they convert certain original *qu* sounds into *p* or leave them as *qu* or *c*. The Italic and the Celtic dialects also resemble one another in the formation of the future and of the passive voice. In the formation of the passive they stood by themselves till recent years, when the Tocharish of Chinese Turkestan and some of the languages found at Boghaz Keui show passive forms of the same type. It is probable therefore that when the Celtic and Italic stocks of the Wiros moved westwards they remained in company longer than other tribes speaking similar languages.

It was not till the seventh century B.C., as is generally supposed, that the Celts found their way into the country which was known to the Romans as Gaul and established themselves in the northern part of what is now France. Among the Celts of modern times there are two well-marked types; a short, dark-haired and generally dark-eyed type, and a tall, frequently red-haired and grey-eyed type. It was this last which impressed the ancient peoples and which they generally describe in their writings and represent in their art. Such a Gaul is the well-known figure of the Pergamene school popularly known as the Dying Gladiator. They are described by Livy as tall men with long red hair carrying huge shields and very long swords, clashing their arms as they entered battle and uttering shouts and cries, but without staying power equal to their size and succumbing readily to heat, dust

and thirst¹. Whether the dark race which was earlier in Gaul than the arrival of the red-haired Celts was also Celtic, or whether it took the language of the conquerors is not clear. The latter is the more likely, and though it is no doubt true that the conquering minority is in most cases absorbed by the subject majority and takes the language of that majority, this is not always true. The French of to-day speak a language they had borrowed from their Roman conquerors, but the Franks were themselves a conquering minority in Gaul. The distinction between the two types of Celtic language is more marked amongst the Celtic dialects in Britain than it was apparently in ancient Gaul. There the 'P-Celts'—that is those who used *petora* for *four*, the equivalent of the Latin *quattuor*—were apparently much more numerous than the 'Q-Celts,' who used *qu*, although this combination seems to be found in the name of the river Seine—Sequana—and in the name of the tribe Sequani.

The invasion of Britain by the Gauls is supposed to have taken place in the third century B.C. There must have been a double invasion, because the Irish, the Scottish Gaelic and the Manx are Q-languages, while Welsh, the now extinct Cornish and the Breton of Brittany are P-languages, the last being, not a remnant of the ancient Gaulish, but the speech of the Celts of Britain who passed over from Cornwall to Brittany in the fifth century A.D. The ancient Picts, whose language, except for some unintelligible inscriptions, is entirely lost, probably belonged to the small black race who spoke a P-language, for the word Picht is still used in Scotland for such a short and dark person.

The question has often been asked as to what has become of the tall, red-haired, brawny Celt in France, where he is now conspicuous by his absence. Not only has this type of Celt disappeared, but the German Frank, who also was tall, fair-haired and brawny, is rarely to be found in France. The explanation no doubt is that, in both cases, the tall fair-haired men were only a governing aristocracy, comparatively small in numbers, and that they have been absorbed by the short, dark-haired and more numerous type. It is fairly certain that, as Dr Beddoe has argued, the conditions of town life are unfavourable to the tall, fair-haired man, who gives way to the short and dark type, a point which it is easy enough for anyone to test by his own observation. In the south-west of Gaul, in Aquitania, the dark Mediterranean type was prevalent, but the invading Gauls overran their country and passed down into Spain, bordering already in the time of Hero-

¹ Livy, xxxviii, 17.

dotus upon the Cynesians, who, he says, are the most westerly people in Europe¹. Details escape us, but a large part of the Iberian peninsula was occupied by a people at least mixed with Celts, as their name, Celtiberi, implies. The earlier inhabitants of Spain seem to have lived in caves as their predecessors of palaeolithic times had done².

According to the legend preserved by Livy the Celtic part of Gaul in the time of Tarquinius Priscus (sixth century B.C.) had for its king Ambigatus of the tribe of the Bituriges³. He, finding in his old age that his sister's sons, Bellovesus and Segovesus, were too hard for him, sent them forth to occupy such lands as the gods should give them, Segovesus to the Hercynian Forest, and Bellovesus to an attack upon Italy, in which not only the Bituriges but also Arverni, Senones, Aedui, and other less well-known tribes joined him. They crossed the Alps, defeated the Etruscans not far from the river Ticinus, and founded the city of Milan. They were followed by Cenomani, who settled in the neighbourhood of Brescia and Verona, while the Boii and Lingones proceeded farther southward beyond the Po and occupied lands held by the Umbrians. The Senones advanced still farther and occupied the eastern side of the Apennines between Forlì and Ancona. It was the Senones, according to Livy, who ultimately attacked and plundered Rome about 390 B.C. We have already seen how, soon after, the Scordisci and other tribes had established themselves in Pannonia. Names like Brigantium (Bregenz) or Vindobona (Vienna) survive to witness to their presence. The Celts mixed readily with other peoples and in southern Gaul we find Celtoligures and far away near the Black Sea the Celtoscythae. From Pannonia as a base they proceeded at the beginning of the third century B.C. to attack the countries to the south, reaching ultimately as far as Delphi. Some of them founded a kingdom in Thrace and others crossed over to Asia. When they had done so they were met by the people of Pergamum, who were their irreconcilable foes, and were driven by them inland. There they took Ancyra, and with three tribes, the Trocmi, the Tolistobogii and the Tectosages, occupied a large part of the ancient Phrygia⁴. In this new home also they were restless, and it has been conjectured that the speakers of the Tocharish language, which bears curious resemblances to Celtic, and is not closely connected with any Indo-European language in Asia, may be a much corrupted tongue of some portion of

¹ Herod. II, 338 IV, 49.

² Livy, V, 34

³ Plutarch, *Sertorius*, 17.

⁴ Livy, XXXVIII, 16.

them, removed by some Anatolian despot to the remotest corner of his empire, much as earlier conquerors had carried the Jews, or Xerxes the Branchidae, away beyond Babylon¹.

We now return to the peoples of Italy whose languages are so closely akin to Celtic. It seems clear from geographical considerations that the P-peoples of Italy came into the peninsula from the north-east and ultimately occupied the greater part of its area. Of these peoples the most important, to judge by their existing remains, were the Umbrians, in historical times situated eastwards of the Apennines, whose territory was encroached upon by the Gauls from the north and by the Etruscans from the west. From the Etruscans, as their existing records show, both the Umbrians and the Oscans had learnt to write, the Etruscans themselves owing the knowledge of writing to the Greeks. Oscan was the language of the richest part of Italy, Campania, and its inscriptions are found sporadically far beyond its confines, in the south of Italy and in Sicily. But the wild country of Calabria was always thinly peopled and the richer soil of the coast lands to the south was early occupied by Greek colonists, who came round through the straits of Messina and established themselves on the rich and beautiful bay of Naples.

According to Roman tradition the Romans did not originally belong to the land in which we find them. To admit that this is true is not to accept the whole story of Aeneas, but when it is recognized that the portion of Latium occupied by the Prisci Latini was very small, and that the possessions of that stock were confined entirely to the right bank of the Tiber, while from the hills a little way off there looked down upon them P-peoples like the Sabines, closely related to the Oscans, and the Volscians, similarly related to the Umbrians, it is clear that the early Latins must have forced their way into this country by the Tiber. If the P-peoples had been the conquerors they would not have remained in the barren hills and left the plain to the Latins. The P-peoples were in the barren hills because they had been driven there by successful invaders.

Where the Romans came from there is no evidence to show, but it is known that the language of the Sikels was closely related to Latin, and it may be conjectured that the invasion of the southern coasts of Italy by the Greeks ousted many peoples from their homes, if, like the Phocaeans amongst the Greeks themselves, they had refused to remain under an alien sovereignty. The ancients thought that the invasion of the Iapygians from Illyria and of the Oscans from Campania had driven the Sikels

¹ Strabo, xi, pp. 517-8; Curtius, vii, 5

from Italy, even at an earlier period. But the Latin alphabet has come from the western Greek alphabet without any intermediary, thus showing that the peoples must have been in close contact at the period when the alphabet was borrowed. Some Sikels survived in Italy even in the time of Thucydides¹. The Faliscans, the only other Q-people of Italy besides the Latins, were clearly but a feeble outpost pushed up into the Etruscan country, and in their language and artistic products strongly affected by that power.

Last among the peoples of Europe we come to the German stock. The name German has never been used by the stock itself in any period of its history, and its origin still remains a matter of dispute. Opinions sway this way and that, some scholars holding that the word *Germani* is but the plural of the Latin adjective *germanus*. Accepting this derivation, some explain it as meaning the true, or genuine, stock, from which apparently the Celts were regarded as an off-shoot, less pure in descent than the Germans. As the Celts had moved into their historic habitat within comparatively recent times, and as the ancients recognized practically no physical differences between Germans and Celts, such an explanation is possible. Another view of the term 'Germani,' held by Strabo and other ancient writers, was that it is used in the sense of brothers, the other members of the family being the Celts. Yet another and less probable view of the derivation of the word is that its origin is a Gaulish word, *gaesum*, which was used for a heavy javelin. To this word is akin the Old High German and Old Saxon *gēr*. Hence, if this derivation were correct, the word would mean javelin men, and soldiers so equipped and named *Gaesati* were found amongst the Gauls². Be this as it may, we find German tribes throughout their history seated to the north of the mountains which surround Bohemia. Thus the German country consisted in early times of forests in the south, and of sandy heathlands in the north. In those lands there is no record of any great migration such as we find frequently in the case of the Celts. The spread of the people was gradual, the population occupying more and more territory as its numbers increased. This extension was further developed when agriculture began, because it was the Germans' custom not to manure their land, but to occupy new ground when their previously occupied land ceased to produce satisfactory harvests³.

¹ Thuc. vi, 2-4.

² *Galatari*, Polybius, ii, 22, 1. As a Latin word it is not found till late. It appears in the name of a Galatian chief, *Gezatorix*, 'king of the spearmen' (Ramsay, *Hist. Geog. As. Minor*, p. 444 sq.).

³ Cp. Caesar, *B.G.* iv, 1, 7; vi, 22, 2; Tacitus, *Germ.* 26, 2.

Before history begins, the population had extended into Jutland, and from Jutland into Scandinavia, in the south-east of which the most characteristic types of Nordic population still survive.

Tacitus regards the German tribes as being all of one language, but on the eastern side of their country there were some tribes, the Fenni, the Venedi, and the Aestii, regarding whose nationality he was in doubt. From the name of Aestii is derived the name of the country known as Esthonia. The language, and a certain element in the population, are of Finnish origin. But the information of Tacitus probably did not extend so far as to enable him to distinguish between Finns and Slavs. To the latter the Venedi, if they were the ancestors of the modern Wends, would certainly belong. If the Bastarnae, who appear in history as early as 179 B.C., having then joined Philip V of Macedon against the Romans, were really Germans, they are the first recorded tribe of this stock; but whether they were Germans or Gauls remains still a vexed question. The Peucini, who lived upon an island in the Danube, were apparently a branch of the Bastarnae. The Cimbri and the Teutones, who made such a furious inroad into more southern lands between 113 and 101 B.C., are said to have come from the north of Germany, driven out by a tremendous flood. In itself the flood is not at all impossible, but a people, so driven from its homes, would hardly be in fit condition to conduct violent warfare with the rest of the world. Their numbers appear to have been very large, though probably Plutarch's estimate of 300,000 fighting men is a gross exaggeration¹. It is just as possible that, as we see in the next century, the German tribes had outgrown their means of subsistence, and were in search of new homes. Unfortunately for themselves, they came into districts already crowded by a population, which, when well led, was more than able to hold its own against them².

Once more, overcrowding in the first century B.C. led to the expe-

¹ Plutarch, *Marius*, xi.

² Like the Bastarnae, the Daci and the Getae, among whom Ovid spent a miserable exile at Tomi on the Black Sea, have been claimed by some authorities as having originally a more northern home than Thrace. Others see in the Daci the same stock that appears in Asia as Dahai or Daoi, the ending *-ci* (Greek *-κοι*) being regarded as a tribal suffix. The Daoi have even been identified with the Indian Dās or Dasyus. These were regarded by the Aryans who invaded India as a different and a hostile stock, which they subdued and enslaved. Phonetically the identification is possible, for in Iranian *-s-* between vowels passes into *-h-*, which in a Greek transliteration, as Daoi (Δᾱοι) is, would disappear. There is however nothing to show that the Dacians and Getae, like the Triballi, Odrysae and many others were not of the Thracian stock.

ditions of Ariovistus across the Rhine, which, upon the appearance of Julius Caesar in Gaul, had the same ill-fortune as had befallen the Cimbri and the Teutones¹. In later times the same impulse drove the German peoples towards the south-east. The maintenance of the Danubian frontier of the Empire against Thracians and Germans became ever more difficult. Conquests were continually being made and continually the old difficulties arose anew. First the Dacians, later the Quadi and other stocks were first resisted and later admitted within the bounds of the Empire. The first important records of a German stock come from the Moeso-Goths, who, in the fourth century A.D. were settled on the northern side of the middle Danube, and became converted to Christianity. The surviving fragments of Bishop Wulfila's translation of the Bible into Gothic is one of the most important records now existing of an early people. But long before this time the German stock had forced its way into the Roman Empire, and though there are no written records in their language, the scenes figured upon the Column of Marcus Aurelius give us considerable information as to their appearance, their dress, and their manner of life.

The most characteristic feature of the German language is the so-called sound-shifting, whereby the labial, dental and guttural stop-consonants change into sounds different from those of the kindred languages, amongst which there is nothing similar, except a less extensive change in Armenian. It may be that similar causes have produced the same effects, and that the sound-shifting in both cases arises from inter-mixture of two peoples, so that a Germanic language in a foreign mouth, probably Celtic, would have produced these changed forms. It is noticeable that a second sound-shifting took place at a much later period in southern Germany, in a district which, at an earlier time, was certainly occupied by Celts.

The Germanic peoples are generally classified in three groups, according to their linguistic characteristics, one group being formed by the Scandinavian languages, which were practically only one language until the eleventh century A.D. A second group is formed by the English, Frisian and German dialects, including both High and Low German, and the Franconian, from which Dutch and Flemish are descended. The third group consists of Gothic, which some scholars are in favour of connecting closely with Scandinavian. A Gothic dialect, now lost, was found in the Crimea, and a number of its words recorded by Busbecq, on his embassy to the Sultan in 1556. This dialect seems to have survived to the eighteenth century, but no traces of it now remain.

¹ Caesar, *B.G.* i, 53.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDATION AND EXPANSION OF THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE¹

I. INTERNAL CONDITIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

IN spite of the strategic isolation and seeming safety of the Nile valley from foreign attack, the country is nevertheless vulnerable on both north and south. Since their occupation of Egypt the British have been called upon to meet dangerous assaults from both directions: from the south at the hands of the Mahdist fanatics; and from the north in the Turkish attack on the Suez Canal during the Great War. These modern experiences of the British in Egypt illustrate very strikingly the ancient situation at the beginning of the New Kingdom or Empire. The Middle Kingdom had fallen to the Hyksos, the Asiatic invaders whom the Egyptians neither forgave nor forgot. What little is known of this mysterious enemy has been recorded (vol. 1, pp. 310 *seq.*, cf. p. 233), and with their expulsion by Ahmose (Aahmes) Egyptian history enters upon a new stage.

No sooner had Ahmose (1580–1557 *c.* B.C.) freed the country from the Hyksos pressure on the northern frontiers than he, likewise, was obliged to turn his attention to the south. The long period of disorganization following the Middle Kingdom had given the Nubians an opportunity to revolt which they did not fail to improve. Ahmose invaded the country and how far he penetrated we do not know, but he evidently met with no serious resistance in the recovery of the old territory between the first and second cataracts. He was no sooner well out of the country, however, than his inveterate rivals in Egypt south of el-Kab, who had troubled him during the Hyksos war, again rose against him.

¹ The following chapters (III–VIII) draw extensively from the author's *History of Egypt*, but every effort has been made to insert all modifications and additions which can be gleaned from new monuments or researches, and which have appeared since it was published. The plan of avoiding footnotes, adopted in the present work, has led to the suppression of some references to such new materials, which have therefore been cited only in the more important cases.

Totally defeated in a battle on the Nile, they rose yet again, and Ahmose was obliged to quell one more rebellion before he was left in undisputed possession of the throne.

The leader of the noble family of el-Kab, Ahmose son of Ebana, who continued faithful to the king, was rewarded for his valour in these actions by the gift of five slaves and five *stat* (nearly three-and-a-half acres) of land at el-Kab, presented to him by his sovereign. It was in this way that the new Pharaoh bound his supporters to his cause. He did not stop, however, with land, slaves and gold, but in some cases even granted to the local princes, the few surviving descendants of the feudal lords of the Middle Kingdom, high and royal titles like 'first king's son,' which while perhaps conveying few or no prerogatives, satisfied the vanity of old and illustrious families, like that of el-Kab, which deserved well at his hands.

There seem to have been but few of the local nobles who thus supported Ahmose and gained his favour. The larger number opposed both him and the Hyksos and perished in the struggle. As their more fortunate rivals were now nothing more than administrative, military or court officials, the feudal lords thus practically disappeared. The lands which formed their hereditary possessions were confiscated and passed to the crown, where they permanently remained. There was one notable exception: the house of el-Kab, to which the Theban dynasty owed so much, was allowed to retain its lands and, two generations after the expulsion of the Hyksos, the head of the house appears as lord, not only of el-Kab but also of Esneh and all the intervening territory. Besides this he was given administrative charge, though not hereditary possession, of the lands of the south from the vicinity of Thebes (Per-Hathor) to el-Kab. This exception serves but to accentuate more sharply the total extinction of the landed nobility, which had so largely formed the substance of the governmental organization under the Middle Kingdom. We do indeed find a handful of barons still bearing their old feudal titles, but they resided at Thebes and were buried there. All Egypt thus became the personal estate of the Pharaoh, just as it did after the destruction of the Mamelukes by Mohammed Ali early in the nineteenth century. It is this state of affairs which in Hebrew tradition was represented as the direct result of Joseph's sagacity (Gen. xlvii, 19 *sq.*).

The course of events, which culminated in the expulsion of the Hyksos, determined for Ahmose the form which the new state was to assume. He was now at the head of a strong army,

effectively organized and welded together by long campaigns and sieges protracted through years, during which he had been both general in the field and head of the state. The character of the government followed automatically out of these conditions. Egypt became a military state. The long war with the Hyksos had now educated the Egyptian as a soldier, the large army of Ahmose had spent years in Asia, and had even been for a longer or shorter period among the rich cities of Syria¹. Having thoroughly learned war, and having perceived the enormous wealth to be gained by it in Asia, the whole land was roused and stirred with a lust of conquest, which was not quenched for two centuries. The wealth, the rewards and the promotion open to the professional soldier were a constant incentive to a military career, and the middle classes, usually so unwarlike, now entered the ranks with ardour. Among the survivors of the noble class the profession of arms became the most attractive of all careers. In the autobiographies which they have left in their tombs at Thebes they narrate with the greatest satisfaction the campaigns which they went through at the Pharaoh's side, and the honours which he bestowed upon them. Many a campaign, all record of which would have been irretrievably lost, has thus come to our knowledge through one of these military biographies, like that of Ahmose, son of Ebana, whom we have already named. The sons of the Pharaoh, who in the Old Kingdom held administrative offices, were now generals in the army.

For the next century and a half, therefore, the story of the achievements of the army will be the story of Egypt, for the army had now become the dominant force and the chief motive power in the new state. In organization it quite surpassed the militia of the old days, if for no other reason than that it was now a standing army. It was organized into two grand divisions, one in the Delta and the other in the upper country. In Syria it had learned tactics and proper strategic disposition of forces, the earliest of which we know anything in history. We shall now find partition of an army into divisions, we shall hear of wings and centre, we shall even trace a flank movement and define battle-lines. All this is fundamentally different from the disorganized plundering expeditions naïvely reported as wars by the monuments of the older periods. The troops were armed as of old with bow and spear, and the infantry was made up of spearmen and archers. While the archers of the Middle Kingdom often carried their

¹ Unless otherwise specified, the term Syria is used to include Palestine (cf. p. 55 *sq.*).

arrows loose in the hand, the quiver¹ had now been introduced from Asia. It was thus the easier for them to learn archery 'fire' by volleys, and the dreaded archers of Egypt now gained a reputation which persisted, and which made them feared even in classic times. But more than this, the Hyksos having brought the horse into Egypt, the Egyptian armies now for the first time possessed a large proportion of chariotry. Cavalry in the modern sense of the term was not employed. The deft craftsmen of Egypt soon mastered the art of chariot-making, while the stables of the Pharaoh contained thousands of the best horses to be had in Asia. In accordance with the spirit of the time, the Pharaoh was accompanied on all public appearances by a body-guard of *élite* troops and a group of his favourite military officers. With such force at his back, the man who expelled the Hyksos was thoroughly master of the situation.

It is evidently in large measure to him that we owe the reconstruction of the state which was now emerging from the turmoils of two centuries of internal disorder and foreign invasion. This new state is revealed to us more clearly than that of any other period of Egyptian history under native dynasties, and while we recognize many elements surviving from earlier times, we discern also much that is new. The supreme position occupied by the Pharaoh meant a very active participation in the affairs of government. He was accustomed every morning to meet the vizier, still the mainspring of the administration, to consult with him on all the interests of the country and all the current business which necessarily came under his eye. Immediately thereafter he held a conference with the chief treasurer. These two men controlled the chief departments of government: the treasury and the judiciary. The Pharaoh's office, in which they made their daily reports to him, was the central organ of the whole government where all its lines converged. Even in the limited number of state or administrative documents preserved to us, we discern the vast array of detailed questions in practical administration which the busy monarch decided. The internal administration required frequent journeys to examine new buildings and check all sorts of official abuses. The official cults in the great temples, too, demanded more and more of the monarch's time and attention as the rituals in the vast state temples increased in complexity with

¹ The quiver was known in the Old Kingdom and is mentioned in the Pyramid Texts: it was used to some extent in the Middle Kingdom and appears in the coffin paintings of that age; but it did not come into general use in Egypt until the Empire.

the development of the elaborate state religion. These journeys were in addition to his many enterprises abroad and often required his personal leadership. Besides frequent campaigns in Nubia and Asia, he visited the quarries and mines in the desert or inspected the desert routes, seeking suitable locations for wells and stations. In these circumstances the burden inevitably exceeded the powers of one man, even with the assistance of his vizier. Early in the XVIIIth Dynasty, therefore, the increasing business of government constrained the Pharaoh to appoint two viziers, one residing at Thebes, for the administration of the south, from the cataract as far as the nome of Siut; while the other, who had charge of all the region north of the latter point, lived at Heliopolis.

For administrative purposes the territory of Egypt was divided into irregular districts, of which there were at least twenty-seven between Siut and the cataract. The country as a whole must have been divided into over twice that number. In the old towns the head of government still bore the feudal title 'count,' but this now indicated solely administrative duties and might better be translated 'mayor' or 'governor.' There was a 'town-ruler' also in each of the smaller towns, but elsewhere there were only recorders and scribes, with one of their number at their head. As we shall see, these men served both as the administrators, chiefly in a fiscal capacity, and also as the judicial officials within their districts.

The great object of government was to make the country economically strong and productive. To secure this end, its lands, now chiefly owned by the crown, were worked by the king's serfs, controlled by his officials, or entrusted by him as permanent and indivisible fiefs to his favourite nobles, his partisans and relatives. Divisible parcels might also be held by tenants of the untitled classes. Both classes of holdings might be transferred by will or sale in much the same way as if the holder actually owned the land. For purposes of taxation all lands and other property of the crown, except that held by the temples, were recorded in the tax-registers of the White House, as the treasury was still called. On the basis of these, taxes were assessed. They were still collected in kind: cattle, grain, wine, oil, honey, textiles, and the like. Besides the cattle-yards, the 'granary' was the chief sub-department of the White House, and there were innumerable other magazines for the storage of its receipts. All the products which filled these repositories were termed 'labour,' the word employed in ancient Egypt as we use 'taxes.' If we may accept

Hebrew tradition as transmitted in the story of Joseph, such taxes comprised one-fifth of the produce of the land (Gen. xlvii, 24 *sq.*).

Unlike early Greece and Rome, which for centuries possessed no organization of state officials for gathering taxes, the Egyptian state from the days of the Old Kingdom had organized its local officials chiefly for that purpose. Their collection and their payment from the various magazines to pay government debts demanded a host of scribes and subordinates, now more numerous than ever before in the history of the country. The chief treasurer at their head was under the authority of the vizier, to whom the former made a report every morning, after which he received permission to open the offices and magazines for the day's business. The collection of a second class of revenue, that paid by the local officials themselves as a tax upon their offices, was exclusively in the hands of the viziers. This tax on the officials consisted chiefly of gold, silver, grain, cattle and linen. Unfortunately our sources do not permit the calculation of even the approximate total of this tax, but the officials under the jurisdiction of the southern vizier paid him annually at least some 220,000 grains of gold, nine gold necklaces, over 16,000 grains of silver, some forty chests and other measures of linen, one hundred and six cattle of all ages and some grain. These figures however are short by probably at least twenty per cent. of the real total. As the king presumably received a similar amount from the northern vizier's collections, this tax on the officials formed a stately sum in the annual revenues. But we can form no estimate of the total of all the revenues.

Of the royal income from all sources in the XVIIIth Dynasty the southern vizier had general charge. The amount of all taxes to be levied and the distribution of the revenue when collected were determined in his office, where a balance-sheet was constantly kept. In order to control both income and outgoings, a monthly fiscal report was made to him by all local officials, and thus the southern vizier was able to furnish the king from month to month with a full statement of prospective resources in the royal treasury. The taxes were so dependent, as they still are, upon the height of the inundation and the consequent prospects of a plentiful or scanty harvest, that the level of the rising river was also reported to him. As the income of the crown was, henceforth, largely augmented by foreign tribute, this was also received by the southern vizier and by him communicated to the king. The great vizier, Rekhmire, depicts himself in the gorgeous reliefs in his tomb receiving

both the tribute of the Asiatic vassal-princes and that of the Nubian chiefs.

✓In the administration of justice the southern vizier played even a greater rôle than in the treasury. Here he was supreme. The magnates of the 'Southern Tens,' as they were called, once possessed of important judicial functions, and 'the six great houses' or courts of justice, of which the vizier was 'chief,' had lost their power or disappeared. Meanwhile, the officers of administration were incidentally the dispensers of justice. They constantly served in a judicial capacity. Although there was no class of judges with exclusively legal duties, every man of important administrative rank was thoroughly versed in the law and must be ready at any moment to serve as judge. The vizier was no exception. All petitioners for legal redress applied first to him in his audience hall; if possible in person, but in any case in writing. For this purpose he held a daily audience or 'sitting' as the Egyptian called it. Every morning the people crowded into the 'hall of the vizier,' where the ushers and bailiffs jostled them into line that they might 'be heard,' in order of arrival, one after another. In cases concerning land located in Thebes he was obliged by law to render a decision in three days, but if the land lay in the 'South or North' he required two months. Such cases demanded rapid and convenient access to the archives. They were therefore all filed in his offices. No one might make a will without filing it in the 'vizier's hall.' Copies of all nome archives, boundary records and all contracts were deposited with him or with his colleague in the north. Every petitioner to the king was obliged to hand in his petition in writing at the same office.

Besides the vizier's 'hall,' also called 'the great council,' there were local courts throughout the land, not primarily of a legal character, being, as we have already explained, merely the body of administrative officials in each district, who were corporately empowered to try cases. They were the 'great men of the town,' or the local 'council,' and acted as the local representatives of the 'great council.' The number of these local courts is entirely uncertain, but the most important two known were at Thebes and Memphis. At Thebes its composition varied from day to day; in cases of a delicate nature, where the members of the royal house were implicated, it was appointed by the vizier; and in case of conspiracy against the ruler, the monarch himself commissioned them, with instructions to determine who were the guilty, and with power to execute the sentence. All courts were largely made up of priests. They did not, however, enjoy the best reputa-

tion among the people, who bewailed the hapless plight of 'the one who stands alone before the court when he is a poor man and his opponent is rich, while the court oppresses him (saying), "Silver and gold for the scribes! Clothing for the servants!"' For of course the bribe of the rich was often stronger than the justice of the poor man's cause.

The law to which the poor appealed had long since been recorded in writing, and much of it was undoubtedly very old. The vizier was obliged to keep it constantly before him, contained in forty rolls (four decalogues) which were laid out before his dais at all his public sessions, where they were doubtless accessible to all. Unfortunately this code has perished, but of its justice we can have no doubt, for apparently already in the Middle Kingdom the vizier had been admonished by the Pharaoh: 'Forget not to judge justice. It is an abomination of the god to show partiality. . . . Behold the dread of a prince is that he does justice. . . . As for him who shall do justice before all the people, it is the vizier.' Even conspirators against the king's life were not summarily put to death, but were handed over to a legally constituted court to be duly tried, and condemned only when found guilty. The great world of the Nile-dwellers under the Empire was therefore not at the mercy of arbitrary whim on the part of either king or court, but was governed by a large body of long respected law, embodying principles of justice and humanity. See pp. 210 *sqq.*

The motive power behind the organization and administration of Egypt was the southern vizier. We recall that he went in every morning and took council with the Pharaoh on the affairs of the country; and the only other check upon his untrammelled control of the state was a law constraining him to report the condition of his administration to the chief treasurer. His office was the means of communication with the local authorities, who reported to him in writing on the first day of each season, that is, three times a year. It is in his office then that we discern the complete centralization of government in practically all its functions. He was minister of war for both army and navy, and he had legal control of the temples throughout the country, so that he was minister of ecclesiastical affairs. Besides his treasury responsibilities, he had economic oversight of many important resources of the country; for no timber could be cut without his permission, and the administration of irrigation and water supply was under his charge. In order to establish the calendar for state business, the rising of Sirius was reported to him (cf. vol. I, p. 168). He exercised advisory functions in all the offices of the state; so long as his office was

undivided with a vizier of the north he was grand steward of all Egypt. He was a veritable Joseph, and it must have been this office which the Hebrew narrator had in mind as that to which Joseph was appointed. He was regarded by the people as their great protector, and no higher praise could be proffered to Amon when addressed by a worshipper than to call him 'the poor man's vizier who does not accept the bribe of the guilty.' His appointment was of such importance that it was made by the king himself, and the instructions given him by the monarch on that occasion were not such as we should expect from the lips of an oriental conqueror three thousand five hundred years ago. They display a spirit of kindness and humanity and exhibit an appreciation of statecraft surprising in an age so remote¹. Such was the government of the imperial age in Egypt.

In society the disappearance of the landed nobility, and the administration of the local districts by an army of petty functionaries of the crown, opened the way more fully than in the Middle Kingdom for numerous official careers among the middle class. These opportunities must have worked a gradual change in their condition. One such official relates his obscure origin thus: 'Ye shall talk of it, one to another, and the old men shall teach it to the youth. I was one whose family was poor and whose town was small, but the Lord of Two Lands [the king] recognized me; I was accounted great in his heart, the king... in the splendour of his palace saw me. He exalted me more than the courtiers, introducing me among the princes of the palace....' Such possibilities of promotion and royal favour awaited success in local administration; for in some local office the career of this unknown official in the small town must have begun. Thus there grew up a new official class, its lower ranks drawn from the old middle class, while on the other hand in its upper strata were the relatives and dependents of the old landed nobility, by whom the higher and more important local offices were administered. Here the official class gradually merged into the large circle of royal favourites who filled the great offices of the central government or commanded the Pharaoh's forces on his campaigns. As there was no longer a feudal nobility, the great government officials and military commanders became the nobles of the Empire, or the

¹ These extraordinary instructions of the Pharaoh addressed to the vizier at the latter's installation are preserved only in the Empire; but they are doubtless of Middle Kingdom date. See Breasted, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, pp. 238-246, where they will be found translated.

New Kingdom, as it is otherwise called. The old middle class of merchants, skilled craftsmen and artists also still survived and continued to replenish the lower ranks of the official class. Below these were the masses who worked the fields and estates, the serfs of the Pharaoh. They formed so large a portion of the inhabitants that the Hebrew scribe, evidently writing from the outside, knew only this class of society beside the priests (Gen. xlvii, 21). These lower strata passed away and left little or no trace, but the official class was now able to erect tombs and mortuary *stelae* in such surprising numbers that they furnish us with a vast mass of materials for reconstructing the life and customs of the time.

An official who took the census in the XVIIIth Dynasty divided the people into 'soldiers, priests, royal serfs and all the craftsmen,' and this classification is corroborated by all that we know of the time; although we must understand that all callings of the free middle class are here included among the 'soldiers.' The soldiers in the standing army had therefore now also become a social class. The free middle class, liable to military service, were called 'citizens of the army,' a term already known in the Middle Kingdom, but now very common; so that liability to military service became the significant designation of this class of society. Politically the soldier's influence grew with every reign and he soon became the natural support of the Pharaoh in the execution of numerous civil commissions where formerly the soldier had never been employed.

Side by side with the soldier appeared another new and powerful influence, the ancient institution of the priesthood. As a natural consequence of the great wealth of the temples under the Empire, the priesthood became a profession, no longer merely an incidental office held by a layman, as in the Old and Middle Kingdoms. As the priests increased in numbers they gained more and more political power; while the growing wealth of the temples demanded for its proper administration a veritable army of temple officials of all sorts, who were unknown in the old days of simplicity. Probably one-fourth of all the persons buried in the great and sacred cemetery of Abydos at this period were priests. Priestly communities had thus grown up. All these priestly bodies were now united in a new sacerdotal organization embracing the whole land. The head of the state temple at Thebes, the High Priest of Amon, was the supreme head of this greater body also, and his power was thereby increased far beyond that of his older rivals at Heliopolis and Memphis. Thus priests, soldiers and officials now stood together as three great social classes.

The state religion maintained by the priesthood was in its outward observances richer and more elaborate than Egypt had ever seen before. The days of the old simplicity were for ever past. The wealth gained by foreign conquest enabled the Pharaohs henceforth to endow the temples with such riches as no sanctuary of the old days had ever possessed. The temples grew into vast and gorgeous palaces, each with its community of priests, and the high priest of such a community in the larger centres was a veritable sacerdotal prince, wielding considerable political power. The high priest's wife at Thebes was called the chief concubine of the god, whose real consort was no less a person than the queen herself, who was therefore known as the 'Divine Consort.' In the gorgeous ritual which now prevailed, her part was to lead the singing of the women who participated in the service. She possessed also a fortune, which belonged to the temple endowment, and for this reason it was desirable that the queen should hold the office in order to retain this fortune in the royal house.

The supremacy of Amon now followed the triumph of a noble of Thebes as it had not done in the Middle Kingdom. Although the rise of a Theban family had then given him some distinction, it was not until now that he became the great god of the state.* His essential character and individuality had already been obscured by the solar theology of the Middle Kingdom, when he had become Amon-Re, and, with some attributes borrowed from his ithyphallic neighbour, Min of Coptos, he now rose to a unique and supreme position of unprecedented splendour. He was popular with the people, too, and, as a Moslem says, *Inshallah* ('If Allah will'), so the Egyptian now added to all his promises 'If Amon spare my life.' They called him the 'vizier of the poor,' the people carried to him their wants and wishes, and their hopes for future prosperity were implicitly staked upon his favour. But the fusion of the old gods had not deprived Amon alone of his individuality, for in the general flux almost any god might possess the qualities and functions of the others, although the dominant position was still occupied by the Sun-god.

The tendencies already plainly observable in the Middle Kingdom had shaped the mortuary beliefs of the Empire. The magical formulae by which the dead were to triumph in the Hereafter became more and more numerous, so that it was no longer possible to record them on the inside of the coffin, but they must be written on papyrus and the roll placed in the tomb.

* It is now known that this practice had its beginnings in the Middle Kingdom.

A highly variable selection of the most important of these texts formed what we now call 'The Book of the Dead.' It was dominated throughout by magic; by this all-powerful means a dead man might effect all that he desired. The luxurious lords of the Empire no longer looked forward with pleasure to the prospect of ploughing, sowing and reaping in the happy fields of Yaru. To escape such peasant labour a statuette bearing the implements of labour in the field and inscribed with a potent charm was placed in the tomb. It insured to the deceased immunity from such toil, which would always be performed by this miniature representative of the deceased whenever the call to the fields was heard. Such 'ushabtis,' or 'respondents,' as they were termed, were now placed in the necropolis by scores and hundreds.

This magical means of obtaining material good was now unfortunately transferred also to the world of ethical values in order to secure exemption from the consequences of an evil life. A sacred beetle or scarabaeus was cut from stone and inscribed with a charm, beginning with the significant words, 'O my heart, rise not up against me as a witness.' So powerful was this cunning invention when laid upon the breast of the mummy under the wrappings, that when the guilty soul stood in the judgment-hall in the awful presence of Osiris, the accusing voice of the heart was silenced and the great god did not perceive the evil of which it would testify. Likewise the rolls of the Book of the Dead containing, besides all the other charms, also the scene of judgment, and especially the welcome verdict of acquittal, were now sold by the priestly scribes to anyone with the means to buy. The fortunate purchaser's name was then inserted in the blanks left for this purpose throughout the document; thus securing for him the certainty of such a verdict, before it was known whose name should be so inserted. The invention of these devices by the priests, in the effort to stifle the admonishing voice within, was undoubtedly subversive of moral progress. The moral aspirations which had come into the religion of Egypt through the Solar theology, and had been greatly quickened by the Osirian myth, were now choked and poisoned by the assurance that, however vicious a man's life, exculpation in the hereafter could be purchased at any time from the priests. The priestly literature on the Hereafter, produced probably for no other purpose than for gain, continued to grow. We have a 'Book of What is in the Nether World,' describing the twelve caverns, or hours of the night through which the Sun passed beneath the earth, and a 'Book of the Portals,' treating of the gates and strongholds between these

caverns. Although these edifying compositions never gained the wide circulation enjoyed by the Book of the Dead, the former of the two was engraved in the tombs of the XIXth and XXth Dynasty kings at Thebes, showing that these grotesque creations of the perverted priestly imagination finally gained the credence of the highest circles. See further, pp. 197 *sqq.*

The cemetery graphically illustrates these developments in Egyptian religion. As before, the tomb of the noble consisted of chambers hewn in the face of the cliff, and in accordance with the prevailing tendency its interior walls were painted with imaginary scenes from the next world and with mortuary and religious texts, many of them of a magical character. At the same time the tomb has also become more of a personal monument to the deceased; and the walls of the chapel bear many scenes from his life, especially from his official career, including particularly all honours received from the king. Thus the cliffs opposite Thebes, honey-combed as they are with the tombs of the lords of the Empire, contain whole chapters of the life and history of the period, with which we shall now deal. In a solitary valley, the 'Valley of the Kings' Tombs,' behind these cliffs the kings excavated their own tombs in the limestone walls and the pyramid⁶ was no longer employed. Deep galleries were driven into the cliffs, and passing from hall to hall, they terminated many hundreds of feet from the entrance in a large chamber, where the body of the king was laid in a huge stone sarcophagus. It is possible that the whole excavation was intended to represent the passages of the Nether World along which the sun passed in his nightly journey.

On the plain east of this valley of tombs (the western plain of Thebes), just as the pyramid temple was built on the east side of the pyramid, arose the splendid mortuary temples of the emperors, of which we shall later have occasion to say more. But these elaborate mortuary customs were now no longer confined to the Pharaoh and his nobles; the necessity for such equipment in preparation for the hereafter was now felt by all classes. The manufacture of such materials, resulting from the gradual extension of these customs, had become an industry; the embalmers, undertakers and manufacturers of coffins and tomb furniture occupied a quarter at Thebes, forming almost a guild by themselves, as they did in later Greek times. The middle class were now frequently able to excavate and decorate a tomb; but when too poor for this luxury, they rented a place for their dead in great common tombs maintained by the priests, and here the

embalmed body was deposited in a chamber where the mummies were piled up like faggots, but nevertheless received the benefit of the ritual maintained for all in common.

II. THE EXPANSION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE DEATH OF HATSHEPSUT

As Ahmose I gradually gained leisure from his arduous wars, the new state and the new conditions slowly emerged. None of his buildings and few of his monuments have survived. His greatest work remains the XVIIIth Dynasty itself, for whose brilliant career his own achievements had laid so firm a foundation. Notwithstanding his reign of at least twenty-two years, Ahmose must have died young (1557 B.C.) for his mother was still living in the tenth year of his son and successor, Amenhotep I. By him he was buried in the old XIth Dynasty cemetery at the north end of the western Theban plain. The jewellery of his mother, stolen from her neighbouring tomb at a remote date, was found by Mariette concealed in the vicinity; and it, together with the body of Ahmose I, is now preserved in the Museum at Cairo.

Affairs in Africa were not long to withhold the sovereigns of the new dynasty from the great achievements which awaited them. Nubia had so long been without a strong arm from the north that Amenhotep I, Ahmose's successor, was obliged to invade the country in force. He penetrated to the Middle Kingdom frontier at the second cataract and, having thoroughly defeated the most powerful chief, placed northern Nubia under the administration of the mayor or governor of the old city of Nekhen (Hieraconpolis), which now became the northern limit of a southern administrative district, including all the territory on the south of it, controlled by Egypt, at least as far as northern Nubia, or Wawat. From this time the new governor was able to go north with the tribute of the country regularly every year.

There was similar trouble in the western Delta where the long period of weakness and disorganization accompanying the rule of the Hyksos had given the Libyans the opportunity, which they had always seized, of pushing in and occupying the rich Delta lands. Though our only source does not mention any such invasion, it is evident that Amenhotep I's war with the Libyans at this particular time can be explained in no other way. Finding their aggressions too threatening to be longer ignored, the Pharaoh now drove them back and invaded their country. Having thus relieved his frontiers and secured Nubia, Amenhotep was at

liberty to turn his arms toward Asia. Unfortunately we have no records of his Syrian war, but he seems to have penetrated far to the north, even to the Euphrates; for he accomplished enough to enable his successor to boast of ruling as far as that river before the latter had himself undertaken any Asiatic conquests. The architect who erected his Theban buildings, all of which have perished, narrates the king's death at Thebes, after a reign of at least ten years.

There is some doubt whether Amenhotep I left a son entitled to the throne. His successor, Thutmose I, was the son of a woman whose birth and family are of doubtful connection, and her great son evidently gained the kingship by his marriage with a princess of the old line, named Ahmose, through whom he could assert a valid claim to the throne. This occurred about January, 1540 or 1535 B.C. Thutmose I at once gave his attention to Nubia, which he reorganized by withdrawing it from the control of the mayor of Nekhen and placing it under the administration of a viceroy with the title: 'Governor of the South Countries, King's-Son of Kush,' although he was not necessarily a member of the royal household or of royal birth. The jurisdiction of the new viceroy extended to the fourth cataract, and it was the region between this southern limit and the first cataract which was known as Kush. There was still no great or dominant kingdom in Kush, nor in lower Nubia, but the country was under the rule of powerful chiefs, each controlling a limited territory. It was impossible to suppress these native rulers at once and nearly two hundred years after this we still find the chiefs of Kush and a chief of Wawat as far north as Ibrim.

In the time of Thutmose I the southern half of the new province was far from being sufficiently pacified, and the king went south early in his second year, personally to oversee the task of more thorough subjugation. Leaving the first cataract in February or March, by early April Thutmose had reached Tangur, about seventy-five miles above the second cataract. Having beaten the barbarians in a decisive battle, he pushed on through the exceedingly difficult country of the second and third cataracts—where his scribes and officers have left a trail of names and titles scratched on the rocks. At the island of Tombos he emerged upon the rich and fertile Dongola province of to-day. Here he erected a fortress, of which some remains still survive, and garrisoned it with troops from the army of conquest, who were to guard the new territory stretching two hundred and fifty miles around the great bend of the Nile from the third to the foot of the fourth cataract. In August of the same year, five

months after he had passed Tangur on the way up, he erected five tablets of victory beside Tombos, on which he boasts of ruling from his new southern frontier to the Euphrates on the north, a statement to which his own achievements in Asia did not yet entitle him. He then began a leisurely return, the slowness of which we can only explain by supposing that he devoted much time to the reorganization and thorough pacification of the country on his way; for he did not reach the first cataract until some seven months after he had erected his monuments of victory at Tombos. With the body of the Nubian chief hanging head downward at the bow of his royal barge, the king passed through the canal at the first cataract and sailed triumphantly northward to Thebes.

The Pharaoh was now able to give his attention to a similar task at the other extremity of his realm, in Asia. Evidently the conquests of Amenhotep I, which had enabled Thutmose I to claim the Euphrates as his northern boundary, had not been sufficient to ensure to the Pharaoh's treasury the regular tribute which he was now enjoying from Nubia, but the conditions in Syria were very favourable for a long continuance of Egyptian supremacy. The geography of the country along the eastern end of the Mediterranean is not such as to permit the gradual amalgamation of small and petty states into one great nation, as had already taken place in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. From north to south, roughly parallel with the four hundred miles of eastern Mediterranean coast, the region is traversed by rugged mountain ranges, in two main ridges, known as the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon in the north. In the south, Lebanon, the western ridge, with some interruptions, drops finally into the bare and forbidding hills of Judah, which merge then into the desert of Sinai south of Palestine. South of the plain of Megiddo, it throws off the transverse ridge of Carmel, which drops like a Gothic buttress, abruptly to the sea. Anti-Lebanon, the eastern ridge, not beginning as far north as Lebanon, shifts somewhat farther eastward in its southern course, interrupted here and there, especially near Damascus, and spreading on the east of the Dead Sea in the mountains of Moab, its southern flanks are likewise lost in the sandy plateau of northern Arabia. Between the two Lebanons, in the fertile valley traversed by the river Orontes, lies the only extensive region in Syria not cut up by hills and mountains, where a strong kingdom might develop¹.

¹ This valley, the *Amki* ('valley') of the Amarna Letters, and the classical Coele Syria (in its most restricted application), is represented by the modern *Bekā'* (*Buḡdā'*), although this term is otherwise applied rather to the high portion of the Orontes valley, south of Kadesh.

The coast is completely isolated from the interior by the ridge of Lebanon, along whose western slopes a people might rise to wealth and power only by maritime expansion. On the other hand, in the south, Palestine, with its harbourless coast and its large tracts of desolate limestone hills, hardly furnished the economic basis for the development of a strong nation. Palestine is, moreover, badly cut up, both by the transverse ridge of Carmel and by the deep cleft in which lie the Jordan and the Dead Sea. Along almost its entire eastern frontier, Syria-Palestine merges into the northern extension of the Arabian desert, save in the extreme north, where the valley of the Orontes and that of the Euphrates almost blend, just as they part, the one to seek the Mediterranean by the Gulf of Alexandretta (Issus), while the other turns away toward Babylon and the Persian Gulf. Syria-Palestine is thus a narrow strip some four hundred miles long and only eighty to a hundred miles wide, hemmed in by the sea on the west and the desert on the east. The long corridor thus formed between desert and sea is the narrow bridge joining Asia and Africa, and the nations distributed along it were inevitably involved in the great rivalry between the leading powers of the two continents as they struggled for supremacy in the earliest imperial rivalries which the inter-continental dominion of the Hyksos had provoked.

The Semitic population which the ancient Pharaohs of the Old Kingdom had found in this region had doubtless been augmented by additional migrations of the nomads from the grassy fringes of the desert. In the north these people were Amorites and, subsequently, Aramaeans, while in the south they may be most conveniently designated as Canaanites (p. 376 n. 1). In general these people showed little genius for government, and were totally without any motives for consolidation. Divided by the physical conformation of the country, they were organized into numerous city-kingdoms, or petty principalities, each consisting of a city, with the surrounding fields and outlying villages, all under the rule of a local dynast, who lived and ruled in the city. Each city had not only its own kinglet, but also its own god, a local *bā'āl* (Baal) or 'lord,' with whom was often associated a *bā'ālāth* or 'lady,' a goddess like that of Byblus. These miniature kingdoms were embroiled in frequent wars with one another, each dynast endeavouring to unseat his neighbour and absorb his territory and revenues. Exceeding all the others in size was the kingdom of Kadesh, probably the surviving nucleus of Hyksos power. It had developed in the only place where the conditions permitted such an ex-

pansion, occupying a very advantageous position on the Orontes. It thus commanded the road northward through inner Syria, the route of commerce from Egypt and the south, which, following the Orontes, diverged thence to the Euphrates, to cross to Assyria, or descend the Euphrates to Babylon. Being likewise at the north end of both Lebanons, Kadesh commanded also the road from the interior seaward through the Eleutherus valley to the Phoenician harbours, especially Arvad and Simyra. We now discern it for two generations, struggling desperately to maintain its independence, and only crushed at last by twenty years of warfare under Thutmose III.

Some of these kingdoms of the interior possessed a high degree of civilization. The craftsmen of Syria learned the arts and crafts from the far older civilization on the Nile. Babylonian caravans and trade had brought in cuneiform writing, which was in common use throughout Syria and far across the Hittite world of Asia Minor; while intrusive elements of culture from the Hittite peoples, as well as from the remarkable civilization of Crete and the Aegean were imparting additional diversity to the composite civilization of this inter-continental region. Like the rest of Asia, the peoples of this region knew more of the art of war than the Egyptians, and in this particular they had, during Hyksos supremacy, taught the Egyptians much.

The Semites were inveterate traders, and an animated commerce was passing from town to town, where the market-place was a busy scene of traffic as it is to-day. On the scanty western slopes of the Lebanon, Semites had by this time long gained a footing on the coast, to become the Phoenicians of historic times. The earliest known reference to them is in the Old Kingdom, where the Egyptians already had dealings with them. The Phoenicians, although hardly as yet a great maritime power—a position more probably held by the Cretans—at least participated in the sea-trade. They entered the Nile mouths, and, sailing up the great river, moored at Thebes and trafficked in its extensive bazaars. Here they perfected their knowledge of the practical arts, learning especially how to cast hollow bronzes, and the new art of making glass vessels which arose in Egypt in the XVIIIth Dynasty. Creeping westward along the coast of Asia Minor they gradually gained Rhodes and the islands of the Aegean; the date is disputed, though it may be as early as 1200 B.C. In many a favourable harbour they eventually established their colonies (see p. 379). Their manufactories multiplied; and everywhere throughout the regions which they reached, their wares were prominent in the

markets. As their wealth increased, every harbour along the Phoenician coast was the seat of a rich and flourishing city, among which Tyre, Sidon, Beirut, Byblus, Arvad and, the northernmost, Simyra, were the greatest, each being the seat of a wealthy dynasty. Thus it was that in the Homeric poems the Phoenician merchant and his wares were proverbial: the commercial and maritime activity of the Phoenicians, as it had been at the rise of the Egyptian Empire, thereafter increased greatly when relieved of all competition by the fall of that Empire and the collapse of Cretan power.

The civilization which the Egyptians found in the northern Mediterranean was Cretan. The sea-people who appear with 'Mycenaean' vessels as gifts and tribute for the Pharaoh in this age, are termed by the Egyptian monuments men of Keftiu (Keftōyew), and so regular was the traffic of the Phoenician fleets with these people that the Phoenician craft plying on these voyages were known as 'Keftiu ships.' All this northern region was known to the Egyptians as the 'Isles of the Sea,' for, having at first no acquaintance with the interior of Asia Minor, they supposed it to be but island coasts, like those of the Aegean. In northern Syria, on the upper reaches of the Euphrates, the world, as conceived by the Egyptians, ended in the marshes in which they thought the Euphrates had its rise, and these again were encircled by the 'Great Circle,' the ocean, which was the end of all.

The northern Mediterranean world, apart from the Phoenicians, and practically all the great peninsula of Asia Minor were non-Semitic. In the great bend of the Euphrates where it sweeps westward toward Syria there was another non-Semitic intrusion. A group of warriors of Iran had by 1500 B.C. pushed westward to the upper Euphrates. In the great western bend of the river they established an Aryan dynasty ruling the kingdom of Mitanni¹. Their influence and language extended westward to Tunip in the Orontes valley and eastward to Nineveh. They formed a powerful and cultivated state, which, planted thus on the road leading westward from Babylon along the Euphrates, effectively cut off the latter from her profitable western trade, and doubtless had much to do with the decline in which Babylon, under her foreign Kassite dynasty, now found herself. Assyria was as yet but a relatively feeble city-kingdom, whose coming struggle with Babylon only rendered the Pharaohs less liable to interference from the east, in the realization of their plans of conquest in Asia. Everything thus conspired to favour the permanence of Egyptian power there.

¹ See vol. I, p. 452 *sq.*, and below, pp. 230, 261 *sq.*, 297.

Seemingly without serious opposition, Thutmose I reached the region of Naharin, or the land of the 'rivers,' as the name signifies, which was the Egyptian designation of the country of Mitanni, as contrasted with its people. The ensuing battle resulted in a great slaughter of the Asiatics, followed by the capture of a large number of prisoners. Unfortunately for our knowledge of Thutmose I's campaigns in Asia, we are dependent entirely upon the scanty autobiographies of the two Ahmoses of el-Kab, which offer us little more than the bald fact of the first campaign, and do not recount any other. Somewhere along the Euphrates at its nearest approach to the Mediterranean, Thutmose now erected a stone boundary-tablet, marking the northern and, at this point, the eastern limit of his Syrian possessions. He had made good the boast so proudly recorded, possibly only a year before, on the tablet marking the other extreme frontier of his empire at the third cataract of the Nile. Henceforth he was even less measured in his claims, for he later boasted to the priests of Abydos, 'I made the boundary of Egypt as far as the circuit of the sun, I made strong those who had been in fear, I expelled evil from them, I made Egypt to become the sovereign and every land her serfs'—words in which it is evident we must see a reference to Egypt's deliverance from humiliation under Hyksos rule and her ensuing supremacy in Asia.

How much Thutmose I may have been able to accomplish in organizing his conquests in Asia we do not yet know. He seems to have been able to retire from his Asiatic war without anxiety and devote himself to the regeneration of Egypt. He was thus able to begin the restoration of the temples so neglected since the time of the Hyksos. The modest old temple of the Middle Kingdom monarchs at Thebes was no longer in keeping with the Pharaoh's increasing wealth and pomp. His chief architect, Ineni, was therefore commissioned to erect two massive pylons, or towered gateways, in front of the old Amon-temple, and between these a covered hall, with the roof supported upon large cedar columns, brought of course, like the splendid electron-tipped flag staves of cedar at the temple front, from the new possessions in the Lebanon. The huge door was likewise of Asiatic bronze, with the image of the god upon it, inlaid with gold. He likewise restored the revered temple of Osiris at Abydos, equipping it with rich ceremonial implements and furniture of silver and gold, with magnificent images of the gods, such as it had doubtless lost in Hyksos days. Admonished by his advancing years, he also endowed it with an income for the offering of mortuary oblations

to himself, giving the priests instructions regarding the preservation of his name and memory.

Thutmose I was now an old man and the claim to the throne which he had thus far successfully maintained may have been weakened by the death of his queen, Ahmose, to whom it is probable his only valid claim to the crown was due. She was the descendant and representative of the old Theban princes who had fought and expelled the Hyksos, and there was a strong party who regarded the blood of this line as alone entitled to royal honours. All her children had died save one daughter, Makere-Hatshepsut, who was thus the only child of the old line, and so strong was the party of legitimacy, that they had forced the king, years before, at about the middle of his reign, to proclaim her his successor, in spite of the disinclination general throughout Egyptian history to submit to the rule of a queen. The close of the reign of Thutmose I is involved in deep obscurity, and there is no reconstruction without its difficulties. The traces left on temple walls by family dissensions are not likely to be sufficiently conclusive to enable us to follow the complicated struggle with entire certainty three thousand five hundred years later. The current verdict of historians has long been that Thutmose II, a feeble and diseased son of the old Pharaoh, followed at once upon his father's demise. His brief reign is of such slight consequence, however, that its exact place in the transition from Thutmose I to Hatshepsut and Thutmose III is not of great importance¹.

Hatshepsut's partisans were not able to crown their favourite without a difficult struggle with a third Thutmose. He was the son of an obscure concubine named Isis, and there is some uncertainty whether the first or the second Thutmose was his father. It is probable that he married Hatshepsut, thus gaining a valid title to the throne. Placed in the Karnak temple as a priest of low rank, he had ere long won the priesthood to his support. By a dramatic *coup d'état* which was at first completely successful, on the third of May, in the year 1501 B.C.², the young Thutmose III suddenly stepped from the duties of an obscure prophet of Amon

¹ The present writer has heretofore followed Sethe in contending that Hatshepsut followed immediately upon Thutmose I, and that the early part of her reign was interrupted by the brief reign of Thutmose II. He is still unable to see how any other reconstruction can be successfully based on the evidence.

² Or three years earlier—accepting Sethe's dating—see footnote below, p. 67.

into the palace of the Pharaohs. On his earliest monuments he made no reference to any co-regency of Hatshepsut, his queen, in the royal titulary preceding the dedication. Indeed he allowed her no more honourable title than 'great' or 'chief royal wife.' But the party of legitimacy was not to be so easily put off. Before long the queen's partisans had become so strong that the king was seriously hampered, and eventually even thrust into the background. Hatshepsut thus became king, an enormity with which the state fiction of the Pharaoh's origin could not be harmonized. She was called 'the female Horus!' The word 'majesty' was given a feminine ending (as in Egyptian it agrees with the sex of the ruler), and the conventions of the court were all warped and distorted to suit the rule of a woman.

The queen now entered upon an aggressive career: she is the first great woman in history of whom we are informed. Her father's architect, Ineni, thus defines the position of the two: after a brief reference to Thutmose III as 'the ruler upon the throne of him who begat him,' he says: 'His sister, the Divine Consort, Hatshepsut, administered the affairs of the Two Lands by her designs; Egypt was made to labour with bowed head for her, the excellent seed of the god, who came forth from him.' Her partisans had now installed themselves in the most powerful offices. Closest to the queen's person stood one, Sennemut, who deeply ingratiated himself in her favour. He had been the tutor of Thutmose III as a child, and he was now entrusted with the education of the queen's little daughter Nefrure. His brother Senmen likewise supported Hatshepsut's cause. The most powerful of her *coterie* however was Hapuseneb, who as both vizier and high priest of Amon, united in his person all the power of the administrative government with that of the strong priestly party. The aged Ineni was succeeded as 'overseer of the gold and silver treasury' by a noble named Thutiy, while one Nehsi was chief treasurer and colleague of Hapuseneb. The whole machinery of the state was thus in the hands of these partisans of the queen. It is needless to say that the careers and probably the lives of these men were identified with the fortunes of Hatshepsut; they therefore took good care that her position should be maintained. In every way they were at great pains to show that the queen had been destined for the throne by the gods from the beginning. In her temple at Der el-Bahri, where work was now actively resumed, they had sculptured on the walls a long series of reliefs depicting the birth of the queen. Here all the details of the old state fiction that the sovereign should be the bodily son of the Sun-god were elabo-

rately pictured. The artist who did the work followed the current tradition so closely that the new-born child appears as a *boy*, showing how the introduction of a woman into the situation was wrenching the inherited forms. With such devices as these and many others, it was sought to overcome the prejudice against a queen upon the throne of the Pharaohs.

Confident in her imperial wealth, Hatshepsut's first enterprise was the building of her magnificent temple against the western cliffs at Thebes. The building was in design quite unlike the great temples of the age. It betrays the influence of the more modest terraced temple tomb of the XIth Dynasty rulers immediately south of Hatshepsut's new building. In a series of three terraces it rose from the plain to the level of an elevated court, flanked by the plastic russet cliffs, into which the holy of holies was cut. In front of the terraces were ranged rhythmic piers and colonnades, which, when seen from a distance, to this day exhibit a fine sense of proportion and of proper grouping, quite disproving the common assertion that the Greeks were the first to understand the art of distributing external colonnades, and that the Egyptians practised the employment of the column only in interiors. The queen found especial pleasure in the design of this temple. She saw in it a paradise of Amon and conceived its terraces as the 'myrrh-terraces' of Punt, the original home of the gods. She refers in one of her inscriptions to the fact that Amon had desired her 'to establish for him a Punt in his house,' but to carry out the design fully it was further necessary to plant the terraces with myrrh trees from Punt and to send an expedition thither to bring them.

Foreign traffic had suffered severely during the long rule of the Hyksos. Indeed, as far back as any one could remember in Hatshepsut's day, even the myrrh necessary for the incense in the temple service had been passed from hand to hand by overland traffic until it reached Egypt. With propitiatory offerings to the divinities of the air to ensure a fair wind, the five vessels of the expedition to Punt set sail early in the ninth year of the queen's reign. The route was down the Nile and through the Middle Kingdom canal leading from the eastern Delta through the Wadi Tūmilāt, and connecting the Nile with the Red Sea. They arrived at Punt in safety and the Egyptian commander pitched his tent on the shore, where he was received with friendliness by Perehu, the chief of Punt, followed by his absurdly corpulent wife and three children. Besides plentiful gifts with which to traffic with these Puntites, the Egyptians brought with them a statue group

of stone showing Queen Hatshepsut with her protector Amon standing beside her. This group was set up in Punt and must be standing there somewhere near the sea at the present day.

Hatshepsut's records tell us that her fleet was laden 'very heavily with marvels of the country of Punt; all goodly fragrant woods of God's-Land, heaps of myrrh-resin, of fresh myrrh-trees¹, with ebony and pure ivory, with green gold of Emu, with cinnamon-wood, with incense, eye-cosmetic, with baboons, monkeys, dogs, with skins of the southern panther, with natives and their children.' After a safe return voyage the fleet finally moored again at the docks of Thebes. Probably the Thebans had never before been diverted by such a sight as now greeted them, when the motley array of Puntites and the strange products of their far-off country passed through the streets to the queen's palace, where the Egyptian commander presented them to her majesty. The queen immediately offered a generous portion of them to Amon, together with the impost of Nubia, with which Punt was always classed. Besides thirty-one living myrrh-trees, she presented to the god, electrum, eye-paint, throw-sticks of the Puntites, ebony, ivory, shells, a live southern panther, which had been especially caught for her majesty, many panther skins and three thousand three hundred small cattle. Huge piles of myrrh of twice a man's stature were measured in grain-measures under the oversight of the queen's favourite, Thutiy, and large rings of commercial gold were weighed in tall balances ten feet high. After formally announcing to Amon the success of the expedition which his oracle had called forth, Hatshepsut then summoned the court, giving to her favourite Sennemut, and the chief treasurer, Nehsi, who had dispatched the expedition, places of honour at her feet, while she told the nobles the result of her great venture. She proudly added: 'I have made for him a Punt in his garden, just as he commanded me.... It is large enough for him to walk abroad in it.' Later she had all the incidents of the remarkable expedition recorded in relief on the wall of her Der el-Bahri temple once appropriated by Thutmose II for the record of his brief Asiatic campaign, where they still form one of the great beauties of her temple. All her chief favourites found place among the scenes. Sennemut was even allowed to depict himself on one of the walls praying to Hathor for the queen, an unparalleled honour.

This unique temple was in its function the culmination of a new development in the arrangement and architecture of the royal

¹ This common Egyptian word should probably be more correctly rendered 'frankincense' than 'myrrh.'

tomb and its chapel or temple. Perhaps because they had other uses for their resources, perhaps because they recognized the futility of so vast a tomb, which yet failed to preserve from violation the body of the builder, the Pharaohs had gradually abandoned the construction of tomb pyramids. Probably for purposes of safety Thutmose I had taken the radical step of separating his tomb from the mortuary chapel before it. The latter was still left upon the plain at the foot of the western cliffs, but the royal sepulchre chamber, with the passage leading to it, was hewn into the rocky wall of a wild and desolate valley, now known as the 'Valley of the Kings' Tombs' (already mentioned above, p. 52), lying *behind* the western cliffs, some two miles in a direct line from the river, and accessible only by a long detour northward, involving nearly twice that distance. It is evident that the exact spot where the king's body was entombed was intended to be kept secret, that all possibility of robbing the royal burial might be precluded. Thutmose's architect, Ineni, says that he superintended 'the excavation of the cliff-tomb of his majesty alone, no one seeing and no one hearing.' Hatshepsut likewise chose a remote and secret spot for her tomb high up on the face of a dangerous cliff behind the Valley of the Kings' Tombs, where it has only recently been discovered; but this she abandoned in favour of a tomb in the valley with her father. The new arrangement was such that the royal sepulchre was still behind the chapel or temple, which thus continued to be on the east of the tomb as before, although the two were now separated by the intervening cliffs. The valley rapidly filled with the vast tomb excavations of Thutmose I's successors. It continued to be the cemetery of the XVIIIth-XXth Dynasties, and over sixty royal tombs of the Empire were excavated there. Sixteen now accessible form one of the wonders which attract the Nile tourists to Thebes, and Strabo speaks of forty which were worthy to be visited in his time. Hatshepsut's terraced sanctuary was therefore her mortuary temple, dedicated also to her father. As the tombs multiplied in the valley behind, there rose upon the plain before it temple after temple endowed for the mortuary service of the departed gods, the emperors who had once ruled Egypt. They were also sacred to Amon as the state god; but they bore euphemistic names significant of their mortuary function. For example, the temple of Thutmose III was called 'Gift of Life.' Hatshepsut's architect, Hapuseneb, who was also her vizier, likewise excavated her tomb in the desolate valley, the second royal sepulchre to be excavated there.

Besides her Der el-Bahri temple and her adjacent tomb, the queen employed her evidently growing wealth also in the restoration of the old temples, which, although two generations had elapsed, had not even yet recovered from the neglect which they had suffered under the Hyksos. She recorded her good work upon a rock temple of Pakht at Beni-Hasan, saying, 'I have restored that which was ruins, I have raised up that which was unfinished since the Asiatics were in the midst of Avaris of the Northland, and the barbarians in the midst of them, overthrowing that which had been made while they ruled in ignorance of Re.' At the same time, in celebration of her royal jubilee she made preparation for the erection of the obelisks, which were the customary memorial of such jubilees. Her invariable favourite, Sennemut, levied the necessary forced labour and began work early in February of the queen's fifteenth year. By early August, exactly six months later, he had freed the huge blocks from the quarry, was able to employ the high water, then rapidly approaching, to float them, and towed them to Thebes before the inundation had again fallen. The queen then chose an extraordinary location for her obelisks, namely, that colonnaded hall of the Karnak temple erected by her father, where her husband Thutmose III had been named king by oracle of Amon; although this involved serious architectural changes and even necessitated permanently unroofing the hall. They were richly overlaid with electrum, the work on which was done for the queen by Thutiy. She avers that she measured out the precious metal by the peck, like sacks of grain, and she is supported in this extraordinary statement by Thutiy, who states that by royal command he piled up in the festival hall of the palace no less than nearly twelve bushels of electrum. These obelisks were the tallest shafts ever erected in Egypt up to that time, being ninety-seven-and-a-half feet high and weighing nearly three hundred and fifty tons each. One of them still stands, an object of daily admiration among the modern visitors at Thebes. It is possible that the queen also set up two more pairs of obelisks, making six in all.

A relief in the Wadi Maghāra in Sinai, whither the tireless queen had sent a mining expedition to resume the work there which had been interrupted by the Hyksos invasion, reveals her operations among the copper mines, in the same year that saw her Karnak obelisks finished. This work in Sinai continued in her name until the twentieth year of her reign. Some time between this date and the close of the year twenty-one, when we find Thutmose III ruling alone, the great queen must have died.

Great though she was, her rule was a distinct misfortune, falling, as it did, at a time when Egypt's power in Asia had not yet been seriously tested, and Syria was only too ready to revolt. Considering the age in which he lived, we must not too much blame Thutmose III for his treatment of the departed queen. Around her obelisks in her father's hall at Karnak he now had a masonry sheathing built, covering her name and the record of her erection of them on the base. Everywhere he had her name erased and in her splendid terraced temple on all the walls both her figure and her name have been hacked out. Her partisans must have met short shrift. In the relief-scenes in the same temple, where Sennemut and Nehsi and Thutiy had been so proud to appear, their names and their figures were ruthlessly chiselled away. The statues and tombs of all the queen's supporters were treated similarly. And these mutilated monuments stand to this day, grim witnesses of the great king's vengeance. But in her splendid temple her fame still lives, and the masonry around her Karnak obelisk has fallen down, exposing the gigantic shaft to proclaim to the modern world the greatness of Hatshepsut.

CHAPTER IV

THE REIGN OF THUTMOSE III

I. THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE

THE peaceful and unmilitary rule of Hatshepsut, falling as it did early in Egypt's imperial career in Asia, was followed by serious consequences. Not having seen an Egyptian army for many years, the Syrian dynasts grew continually more restless. The king of Kadesh, once probably the suzerain of all Syria and Palestine, had stirred all the city-kings of northern Palestine and Syria to accept his leadership in a great coalition, in which they at last felt themselves strong enough to begin open revolt. 'Behold from Yeraza (in northern Judea) to the marshes of the earth (*i.e.* the upper Euphrates), they had begun to revolt against his majesty.' In these words the annals of Thutmose III record the Asiatic situation. Only southern Palestine was loth to take up arms against the Pharaoh, for its people had witnessed the long siege of Sharuhén at the hands of Ahmose in Hyksos days (vol. I, p. 315), and they were too well aware of what to expect, to assume thoughtlessly the offensive against Egypt. Not only were 'all the allied countries of Zahi' (Syria) in open rebellion against the Pharaoh, but it is also evident that the powerful kingdom of Mitanni, on the east of the Euphrates, had done all in her power to support the rebellion. It was natural that Mitanni should view with distrust the presence of a new empire on its western borders; and its king exerted himself to the utmost to rehabilitate the once great kingdom of Kadesh, as a buffer between himself and Egypt.

The armies of the early Orient, at least those of Egypt, were not large, and it is not probable that any Pharaoh ever invaded Asia with more than twenty-five or thirty thousand men, while less than twenty thousand is probably nearer the usual figure. Late in his twenty-second year we find Thutmose with his army ready to take the field. He marched from Tharu, the predecessor of modern Kantara, the last Egyptian city on the north-eastern Delta frontier, about the 19th of April, 1479¹ B.C.¹ Nine days


¹ Sethe has concluded that the new moon dates in Thutmose III's Annals, from which this date (1479 B.C.) is computed, should be considered as *real* new moon dates, and not dates when the new moon became *visible*. This would make this date 1482 B.C., as formerly calculated by Mahler in *P.S.B.A.*, 1895, p. 281. See Sethe, *Gesell. der Wiss. Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1919, p. 289.

later (April 28th) he reached Gaza, one hundred and sixty miles from Tharu. Although it was the anniversary of his coronation, he was not the man to waste the day in a futile celebration, but having arrived in the evening of the coronation anniversary, he was away for the north again the very next morning. In the evening of May 10th he camped at Yehem, a town of uncertain location, some eighty or ninety miles from Gaza, on the southern slopes of the Carmel range.

Meantime the army of the Asiatic allies, under the command of the king of Kadesh, had pushed southward as far as the territory of their adherents extended, and had occupied the strong fortress of Megiddo, on the north slope of the Carmel ridge. This transverse ridge formed the first effective barrier confronting an army invading Asia from Egypt, and the king of Kadesh showed good strategic judgment in selecting it for his first stand against the advancing Egyptians. Megiddo, which here appears in history for the first time, was not only a powerful stronghold, but occupied an important strategic position, commanding the road from Egypt between the two Lebanons to the Euphrates, hence its prominent rôle in oriental history from this time on.

As Thutmose neared Carmel he learned of the enemy's occupation of Megiddo, and called a council of his officers to ascertain the most favourable route for crossing the ridge and reaching the plain of Esdraelon beyond. There were three roads practicable for an army leading over the mountain; one which made a direct line for the gates of Megiddo, and two involving a detour toward either side: the first southward by way of Taanach, about five miles south-east of Megiddo; and the other, northward, emerging on the north-west of Megiddo. Thutmose characteristically favoured the direct route, but his officers urged that the other roads were more open, while the middle one was a narrow pass. 'Will not horse come behind horse,' they asked, 'and man behind man likewise? Shall our advance-guard be fighting while our rear-guard is yet standing in Aruna (far in the rear)?' These objections showed a good military understanding of the dangers of the pass; but Thutmose swore a round oath that he would move against his enemies by the most direct route, and his officers might follow or not as they pleased. Accordingly, on the 13th of May he personally took the head of the column, vowing that none should precede him, but that he would go 'forth at the head of his army himself, showing the way by his own footsteps.' At this juncture his army must have been distributed for a great distance along the road from Aruna back to Yehem; but on the

morning of the 14th he pushed quickly forward again into the historic pass.



The Battle of Megiddo¹.

It was just past midday when his forward column emerged from the pass and overlooked the plain of Megiddo, the

¹ From H. H. Nelson, *The Battle of Megiddo*, Map iv. The Egyptian lines were between the foot-hills A, B, C, D, E and the mounds G, H, I; the Hittite chariots were probably between G and H, the latter of which slopes steeply to the brook Kina. Sethe's new collation of Thutmose III's Annals (*Urkunden*, iv. 652 sq.) indicates that the pass was unoccupied by the enemy, and there was no fighting for its possession as formerly supposed. We lose this bit of evidence with regret, for it furnished a very interesting and exact parallel with Lord Allenby's experience in 1918.

first army we are able to follow as it enters that historic plain, which, as *Armageddon*, has become the proverbial battle-field of the ages from Thutmose III to Lord Allenby. Indeed the pass through which Thutmose went was the same as that through which Allenby flung his cavalry to positions in the rear of the fleeing Turks in 1918. By one o'clock Thutmose halted without opposition on the south of Megiddo, 'on the bank of the brook Kina.' The Asiatics had thus lost an inestimable opportunity to destroy him in detail. They seem to have been posted too far south-eastward toward Taanach to draw in quickly and concentrate against his thin line of march as it defiled from the mountains. It is impossible to determine the exact position of the Asiatics, but when the skirmishing in the mountains took place their southern wing was at Taanach, doubtless in expectation that Thutmose would cross the mountain by the Taanach road. Late in the afternoon of the same day (the 14th), or during the ensuing night, Thutmose took advantage of his enemy's position on the east and south-east of his own force to draw his line around the west side of Megiddo and boldly threw out his left wing on the north-west of the city. He thus secured, in case of necessity, a safe and easy line of retreat westward along the Zeftr road, while at the same time his extreme left might cut off the enemy from flight northward.

To protect their stronghold the Asiatics drew in between the Egyptian forces and the city. Early the next morning (May 15th) Thutmose led forth his army in order of battle. In a shining chariot of electrum he took up his position with the centre; his right or southern wing rested on a hill south of the brook of Kina; while, as we have seen, his left was north-west of Megiddo. He immediately attacked, leading the onset himself 'at the head of his army.' The enemy gave way at the first charge. Thutmose's Annals show evident gratification at the humiliating flight of the Asiatics: 'they fled headlong to Megiddo in fear, abandoning their horses and their chariots of gold and silver, and the people hauled them up, pulling them by their clothing into this city; the people of this city having closed it against them and lowered clothing to pull them up into this city. Now if only the army of his majesty had not given their heart to plundering the things of the enemy they would have captured Megiddo at this moment, when the wretched vanquished king of Kadesh and the wretched vanquished king of this city (Megiddo) were hauled up in haste to bring them into this city.' The discipline of the Egyptian host could not resist the spoil of the combined armies of Syria. 'Then

were captured their horses, their chariots of gold and silver were made spoil.... Their champions lay stretched out like fishes on the ground. The victorious army of his majesty went round counting the spoils, their portions. Behold there was captured the tent of that wretched vanquished foe (the king of Kadesh) in which was his son.... The whole army made jubilee, giving praise to Amon for the victory which he had granted to his son (the Pharaoh).... They brought in the booty which they had taken, consisting of hands (severed from the slain), living prisoners, of horses, chariots, gold and silver.' It is thus evident that in the disorganized rout the camp of the king of Kadesh fell into the hands of the Egyptians.

Hereupon Thutmose gave orders for the investment of the city: 'they measured this city, surrounding it with an enclosure, walled about with green timber of all their pleasant trees. His majesty himself was upon the fortification east of the city, inspecting what was done.' Thutmose boasts after his return to Egypt, saying, 'Amon gave to me all the allied countries of Zahi shut up in one city.... I snared them in one city, I built around them with a rampart of thick wall.' They called this wall of investment: 'Thutmose is the Ensnarer of the Asiatics,' according to the custom under the Empire of naming every royal building after the king. As the siege went on, the dynasts who were fortunate enough not to be shut up in the city hastened to make their peace with the incensed Pharaoh: 'The Asiatics of all countries came with bowed head, doing obeisance to the fame of his majesty.'

The king of Kadesh was not among the prisoners; he had escaped before the completion of the investment. To compensate for the failure to capture this dangerous enemy, the Egyptians secured his family as hostages; for Thutmose says, 'Lo, my majesty carried off the wives of that vanquished one, together with his children, and the wives of the chiefs who were there, together with their children.' The catalogue of the spoils found in the fallen city, as given in Thutmose's Annals, is a surprising revelation of the wealth and splendour of contemporary Syria. Nine hundred and twenty-four chariots, including those of the kings of Kadesh and Megiddo, two thousand two hundred and thirty-eight horses, two hundred suits of armour, again including those of the same two kings, the gorgeous tent of the king of Kadesh, the magnificent household furniture of the same king, and among it his royal sceptre, a silver statue, perhaps of his god, and an ebony statue of himself, wrought with gold and lapis

lazuli, besides immense quantities of gold and silver were taken from the city.

In order to prevent another southward advance of the still unconquered king of Kadesh and to hold command of the important road northward between the Lebanons, Thutmose pushed northward and built a fortress at this point, which he called 'Thutmose-is-the-Binder-of-the-Barbarians.' He now began the reorganization of the conquered territory, supplanting the old revolting dynasts with others who might be expected to show loyalty to Egypt. These new rulers were allowed to govern much as they pleased, if only they regularly and promptly sent in the yearly tribute to Egypt. To hold them to their obligations Thutmose carried off with him to Egypt their eldest sons, whom he placed in a special quarter or building called 'Castle in Thebes.' Here they were educated and so treated as to engender feelings of friendliness toward Egypt. Later, whenever a king of one of the Syrian cities died 'his majesty would cause his son to stand in his place.' Thutmose now controlled all Palestine as far north as the southern end of Lebanon, and farther inland also Damascus. In so far as they had rebelled, he stripped all the towns of their wealth, and returned to Egypt with some four hundred and twenty-six pounds of gold and silver in commercial rings, or wrought into magnificent vessels and other objects of art, besides untold quantities of less valuable property and the spoil of Megiddo already mentioned.

In less than six months, that is, within the limits of the dry season in Palestine, he had marched from Tharu, gained a sweeping victory at Megiddo, captured the city after a long and arduous investment, marched to the Lebanon and taken three cities there, built and garrisoned a permanent fort near them, begun reorganizing the government in northern Palestine, and completed the return journey to Thebes, which he reached early in October. With what difficulties such an achievement was beset we may learn not only from Napoleon's campaign from Egypt over the same route against Acre, which is almost exactly as far from Egypt as Megiddo, but also by following Lord Allenby's brilliant campaign against the Turks through the same country. We may then understand why it was that Thutmose immediately celebrated three 'Feasts of Victory' in his capital. These feasts were made permanent, and endowed with an annual income of plentiful offerings. At the feast of Opet, which was Amon's greatest annual feast and lasted eleven days, he presented to the god the three towns which he had captured in Lebanon, besides

a rich array of magnificent vessels of gold, silver and costly stones from the prodigious spoils of Retenu¹. In order to furnish income to maintain the temple on the sumptuous plan thus projected, he gave Amon not only the said three towns, but also extensive lands in Upper and Lower Egypt, and supplied them with plentiful herds and with hosts of serfs taken from among his Asiatic prisoners. Thus was established the foundation of that vast fortune of Amon, which now began to grow out of all proportion to the increased wealth of other temples. Nevertheless, if we may judge from the small temple of Ptah by the great Karnak sanctuary which Thutmose also rebuilt at his return from his campaign, he probably showed like generosity to the two more ancient sanctuaries at Heliopolis and Memphis, of which the former was still in a traditional sense the temple of the State-god, in that Amon had long been identified with the Sun-god of Heliopolis.

Egyptian power in Asia during the long military inactivity of Hatshepsut's reign had been so thoroughly shaken that Thutmose III was far from ready, as a result of the first campaign, to march immediately upon Kadesh, his most dangerous enemy. Moreover, he desired properly to organize and render perfectly secure the states already under the power of Egypt. In the twenty-fourth year, therefore, on his *second campaign*, he marched in a wide curve through the conquered territory of northern Palestine and southern Syria, while the dynasts came to pay their tribute and do him homage in 'every place of his majesty's circuit where the tent was pitched.' The news of his great victory of the year before had by this time reached Assyria, till then a small power far over on the upper Tigris. Her king naturally desired to be on good terms with the great empire of the west, and the gifts of costly stone, chiefly lapis lazuli from Babylon, and the horses which he sent to Thutmose, so that they reached him while on this campaign, were, as usual, interpreted by the Egyptians as tribute. In all probability no battles were fought on this expedition.

Thutmose's return to Thebes, which again fell in October, gave him opportunity to plan for the enlargement of the Karnak temple, to suit the needs of the empire of which he dreamed. As the west end, the real front of the temple, was marred by Hatshepsut's obelisks, rising from his father's dismantled hall, and he was unable or unwilling to build around his father's obelisks, which stood before the western entrance of the temple, Thutmose III laid out his imposing colonnaded halls at the other, or east

¹ An Egyptian designation of the general region of Syria-Palestine, having geographical rather than political significance.

end, of the temple, where they to-day form one of the great architectural beauties of Thebes. The greatest hall is nearly one hundred and forty feet long, and lies transversely across the axis of the temple. Behind it is the sanctuary, or holy of holies, while grouped about it are some half a hundred halls and chambers. Among these, on the south side, was a hall for the mortuary service of his ancestors. In the chamber to which this hall led he 'commanded to record the names of his fathers, to increase their offerings and to fashion statues of all these their bodies.' These names formed an extensive list which was removed and is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Though many of the statues of his fathers have perished, some have been discovered in a court south of the temple, where they had been concealed for safety presumably in time of war.

When Thutmose returned from his *third campaign*, chiefly an organizing expedition, his building at Karnak was sufficiently far advanced to record upon the walls of one of the chambers the plants and animals of Asia which he had found on his march and brought home with him to beautify the garden of the temple of Amon, the sacred lake of which he supplied with a masonry coping. No records of the *fourth campaign* have survived, but the course of his subsequent operations were such that it must have been confined like the others to the territory already regained, that is the southern half of the future Asiatic empire.

It had now become evident to Thutmose that he could not march northward between the Lebanons and operate against Kadesh, while leaving his left flank exposed to the unsubdued Phœnician cities of the coast. It was likewise impossible to strike Naharin and Mitanni without first destroying Kadesh, which dominated the Orontes valley. He therefore organized a fleet which would enable him to land an army on the north Syrian or Phœnician coast. He conceived that he would then be able to use the coast as a base of operations against Kadesh and the interior; and this being once disposed of, he could again push in from the coast against Mitanni and the whole Naharin region. No modern strategist could have conceived a series of operations better suited to the conditions¹, nor have gone about putting them into execution with more indomitable energy than Thutmose now displayed. In the year twenty-nine, on his *fifth campaign*, he moved for the first time against the northern coast cities, the wealthy

¹ Indeed, could the same strategy have been followed in the Great War it may be confidently assumed that the Allied campaign against the Turks would have been completed in the first year of the war.

commercial kingdoms of Phoenicia. The name of the first city which Thutmose took is unfortunately lost, but it was on the coast opposite Tunip, and must have been a place of considerable importance, for it brought him rich spoils; and there was in the town a temple of Amon, erected by one of Thutmose III's predecessors (either Thutmose I or possibly Amenhotep I). Tunip sent forces from the interior to strengthen the garrison of this unknown city, the fall of which would involve the ultimate capture of Tunip also. Thutmose now seized the fleet of the city, and was able rapidly to move his army southward against the powerful city of Arvad. A short siege, compelling the Pharaoh to cut down the groves about the town, as at Megiddo, sufficed to bring the place to terms, and with its surrender a vast quantity of the wealth of Phoenicia fell into the hands of the Egyptians. Besides this, it being now autumn, the gardens and groves 'were filled with their fruit, their wines were found left in their presses as water flows, their grain on the (hillside) terraces...; it was more plentiful than the sand of the shore. The army were overwhelmed with their portions.' Under these circumstances it was useless for Thutmose to attempt to maintain discipline, and during the first days following the surrender, 'behold the army of his majesty was drunk and anointed with oil every day as at a feast in Egypt.' The dynasts along the coast now came in with their tribute and offered submission. Thutmose had thus gained a secure footing on the northern coast, easily accessible by water from Egypt, and forming an admirable base for operations inland as he had foreseen. He then returned to Egypt, possibly not for the first time, by water.

It had taken five expeditions to gain the south and the coast; the *sixth campaign* was at last directed against Kadesh, his long invulnerable enemy. In the year thirty the close of the spring rains found Thutmose disembarking his army from the fleet at Simyra, by the mouth of the Eleutherus, up the valley of which he immediately marched upon Kadesh. The city lay on the west side of the Orontes river at the north end of the high valley between the two Lebanons. A small tributary of the Orontes joined the larger stream from the west just below the city, so that it lay on a point of land between the two. A canal was cut across the tongue of land above the town, thus connecting the two streams and entirely surrounding the place by water. Within the banks of the rivers an inner moat encircling the high curtain-walls re-enforced the natural water-defences, so that, in spite of its location in a perfectly level plain, it was a place of great

strength, and probably the most formidable fortress in Syria. In its relation to the surrounding country also the place was skilfully chosen; for, besides commanding the Orontes valley, it also dominated the only road inland from the coast for a long distance both north and south. This was the road up the Eleutherus valley, along which we have followed Thutmose. The capture of such a place by siege was an achievement of no slight difficulty, and indeed the siege continued long enough to encourage the coast cities in the hope that Thutmose had suffered a reverse. In spite of the chastisement inflicted upon Arvad the year before, the opulent harbour town could not resist an attempt to rid itself of the annual obligation to the Pharaoh. As soon as Kadesh fell, however, Thutmose quickly returned to Simyra, embarked his army on his waiting fleet and sailed to Arvad to inflict swift retribution.

This revolt showed Thutmose that he must devote another campaign to the thorough subjugation of the coast before he could safely push inland beyond the valley of the Orontes on the long planned advance into Naharin. He therefore spent the summer of the year thirty-one, the *seventh campaign*, in completely quenching any smouldering embers of revolt in the coast cities. He skirted the coast with his fleet, entering harbour after harbour, displaying his force and thoroughly organizing the administration of the cities. In particular he saw to it that every harbour-town should be liberally supplied with provisions for his coming campaign in Naharin. On his return to Egypt he found envoys from the extreme south, probably eastern Nubia, bringing to the Pharaoh their tribute, which shows that he was maintaining an aggressive policy in the far south while at the same time so active in the north.

It was not until the spring of the year thirty-three that Thutmose was able to land his forces in the harbour of Simyra, on his *eighth campaign*. For the second time he marched inland along the Kadesh road, this time with the Euphrates country as his objective. Continuing the march northward down the Orontes, he fought a battle at the city of Senzar, where he probably crossed and forsook the Orontes. He now entered Naharin and, marching rapidly on, found no serious force confronting him until he had arrived at the 'Height of Wan, on the west of Aleppo,' where a considerable battle was fought. Aleppo itself must have fallen, for the Pharaoh could otherwise hardly have pushed on without delay, as he evidently did. 'Behold his majesty went north, capturing the towns and laying waste the settlements of that foe

of wretched Naharin,' who was, of course, the king of Mitanni. Egyptian troops were again plundering the Euphrates valley, a license which they had not enjoyed since the days of their fathers under Thutmose I, some fifty years before. A victorious battle at Carchemish at last enabled Thutmose to do what he had been fighting ten years to attain, for he now crossed the Euphrates into Mitanni and set up his boundary tablet on the east side. Without wintering in Naharin however, it was impossible for Thutmose to advance farther, and he was too wise a soldier to risk exposing to the inclement northern winter the seasoned veterans of so many campaigns. He therefore returned unmolested to the west shore, where it would seem he found the tablet of his father, Thutmose I, and with the greatest satisfaction he set up another of his own alongside it. His troops had already harvested the fields of the Euphrates valley, and it was now late in the season. Before he returned, however, one serious enterprise still awaited him. The city of Niy, somewhere in the region between Aleppo and the Euphrates, was still unconquered and all his work in Naharin might be undone were this place left unscathed. In so far as we know, the capture of Niy was an enterprise quickly achieved. Thutmose was then at liberty to relax and we learn that he organized a great elephant hunt in the region of Niy, where these animals have now been extinct for ages. He and his party attacked the north Syrian herd of one hundred and twenty animals. In the course of the hunt the king, having come to close quarters with one great beast, was in some danger when his general, Amenemhab, rushed between and cut off the animal's trunk, thus diverting the infuriated animal at the critical moment.

All western Asia was now apprehensively watching the expansion of the Pharaoh's power. The local princes and dynasts of Naharin appeared at his camp and brought in their tribute as a token of their submission. Even far off Babylon was now anxious to secure the goodwill of the Pharaoh, and its king sent him gifts wrought of lapis lazuli. But what was still more important, the mighty people of the Kheta, whose domain stretched far away into the unknown regions of Asia Minor, sent him a rich gift. As he was on the march from Naharin to reach the coast again the envoys from the king of 'Great Kheta' met him. They bore eight massive commercial rings of silver, weighing nearly ninety-eight pounds, besides some unknown precious stone and costly wood. In 'Great Kheta' we must recognize the 'Hittite' empire, thus emerging for the first time, as far as we know, upon the stage of oriental history (see chap. xi). On Thutmose's arrival at

the coast, he laid upon the chiefs of the Lebanon the yearly obligation to keep the Phœnician harbours supplied with the necessary provision for his campaigns. From any point in this line of harbours, which he could reach by ship from Egypt in a few days, he was then able to strike inland without delay and bring delinquents to an immediate accounting. His sea-power, the first that we can discern in history, was such that the king of Alashiya (? Cyprus) became practically a vassal of Egypt, as later in Saitic times. Moreover, the Pharaoh's fleet made him so feared in the islands of the north that he was able to exert a loose control over the eastern Mediterranean, as far as the islands of the Aegean. Thus, his general, Thutiy, includes 'the isles in the midst of the sea,' that is, the Aegean Islands, as within his jurisdiction as 'governor of the north countries.' Egypt's maritime supremacy in the fifteenth century B.C. was thus an obvious anticipation of the sea-power of the Ptolemies in the Greek Age.

II. THE EMPIRE OF THUTMOSE III

This expansion of Egyptian power in the north and north-west was balanced by similar aggressiveness in the south and south-west. From Punt Thutmose's expeditions, seemingly of more than merely mercantile power, brought back the usual rich and varied cargoes of ivory, ebony, panther-skins, gold, and over two hundred and twenty-three bushels of myrrh, besides male and female slaves and many cattle. At some time during these wars Thutmose also gained possession of the entire oasis-region on the west of Egypt. The oases thus became Pharaonic territory and were placed under the government of Intef, Thutmose's herald, who was a descendant of the old line of lords of Thinis-Abydos, whence the Great Oasis was most easily reached. The oasis-region remained an appanage of the lords of Thinis and became famous for its fine wines.

The kings of western Asia, whom Thutmose's fathers had been able to defeat singly and in succession, he had been obliged to meet united; and against the combined military resources of Syria and northern Palestine under their old-time Hyksos suzerain of Kadesh, he had forced his way through to the north. He might pardonably permit himself some satisfaction in the contemplation of what he had accomplished in ten years of campaigning in Asia. Nearly thirty-three years had elapsed since the day when Amon called him to the throne. Already on his thirtieth anniversary his architect, Puemre, had erected the jubilee obelisks at Thébes;

but on his return from the great campaign the date for the customary second jubilee-celebration was approaching. A pair of enormous obelisks, which had been in preparation for the event, were erected at the Karnak temple and one of them bore the proud words, 'Thutmose, who crossed the great "Bend of Naharin" [the Euphrates] with might and with victory at the head of his army.' The other obelisk of this pair has perished, but this one now stands in Constantinople. Indeed, of the great king's obelisks in Egypt, all have either perished or been removed, so that not a single one still stands in the land he ruled so mightily, while the modern world possesses a line of them reaching from Constantinople, through Rome and London to New York. The last two, which commemorate his fourth jubilee-celebration, now rise on opposite shores of the Atlantic, on the Thames Embankment and in Central Park, as they once stood on either side of the approach to the Sun-temple at Heliopolis.

These stately shafts were not the only memorials of Thutmose's achievements. On the walls of the magnificent Karnak temple were recorded long annals of his victories in Asia, extensive lists of the plunder he had taken, with splendid reliefs picturing the rich portion which fell to Amon. A list of one hundred and nineteen towns which he captured on his first campaigns was three times displayed upon the pylons, while from his recent successes in the north the same walls bore a record of no less than two hundred and forty-eight towns which had submitted to him. Unfortunately these records are but excerpts from the state-records, made by priests who wished to explain the source of the gifts received by the temple, and to show how Thutmose was repaying his debt to Amon for the many victories which the favouring god had vouchsafed him. Hence they are but meagre sources from which to reconstruct the campaigns of the first great strategist of whom we know anything in history.

But the Thebans were not restricted to the monuments of Karnak for evidence of the greatness of their king. In the gardens of Amon's temple, as we have seen, grew the strange plants of Syria, while Asiatic animals unknown to the hunter of the Nile valley wandered among trees equally unfamiliar. Envoys from the north and south were constantly appearing at the court. Levantine galleys, such as the upper Nile had never seen before, delighted the eyes of the curious crowd at the docks of Thebes; and from these landed sumptuous cargoes of the finest stuffs of Phoenicia, gold and silver vessels of magnificent workmanship from the cunning hand of the Tyrian artificer or the workshops

of distant Asia Minor, Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean Islands; exquisite furniture of carved ivory, delicately wrought ebony, chariots mounted with gold and electrum, and bronze implements of war; besides these, fine horses for the Pharaoh's stables and untold quantities of the best that the fields, gardens, vineyards, orchards and pastures of Asia produced. Under heavy guard emerged from these ships, too, the annual tribute of gold and silver in large commercial rings, some of which weighed as much as twelve pounds each, while others for purposes of daily trade were of but a few grains weight. Winding through the streets crowded with the wondering Theban multitude, the strange-tongued Asiatics in long procession bore their tribute to the Pharaoh's treasury. They were received by the vizier, Rekhmire, and when unusually rich tribute was presented, he conducted them to Thutmose's presence, where, enthroned in splendour, the Pharaoh reviewed them and praised the vizier and his officials for their zeal in his behalf. It was such scenes as this that the vizier and the treasury officials loved to perpetuate in gorgeous paintings on the walls of their tombs, where they are still preserved at Thebes. The amount of wealth which thus came into Egypt from Asia and Nubia must have been enormous for those times, and on one occasion the treasury was able to weigh out some eight thousand nine hundred and forty-three pounds of gold-silver alloy.


Similar sights diverted the multitudes of the once provincial Thebes when every year, toward the close of September or the opening days of October, Thutmose's war-galleys moored in the harbour of the town. But at this time not merely the wealth of Asia was unloaded from the ships, the Asiatics themselves, bound one to another in long lines, were led down the gang-planks to begin a life of slave-labour for the Pharaoh. They wore long matted beards, an abomination to the Egyptians; their hair hung in heavy black masses upon their shoulders, and they were clad in gaily-coloured woollen stuffs, such as the Egyptian, spotless in his white linen robe, would never put on his body. Their arms were pinioned behind them at the elbows or crossed over their heads and lashed together, or, again, were thrust through odd pointed ovals of wood, which served as hand-cuffs. The women carried their children slung in a fold of the mantle over their shoulders. With their strange speech and uncouth postures the poor wretches were the subject of jibe and merriment on the part of the multitude, while the artists of the time could never forbear caricaturing them.* Many of them found their way into the houses

MAP OF EGYPT AND THE ANCIENT WORLD

MAP 1

INDEX TO NAMES

- Akkad, D 7
 Akkad, of, EF 7
 Akkad, D 6
 Akkad, BCD 6
 Akkad, B 3
 Akkad, C 6, 7, D 7
 Ammonium or Oases Suwa, B 4
 Arabia, D 3-F 6
 Assuan (Aswan), C 5
 Athara, R, D 6
 Azumia, D 7
 Babylon, E 3
 Babylon, EF 3
 Bagdad, E 3
 Beirut, D 3
 Berenice, D 4
 Black Sea, CD 1
 Bosphorus (Keul), C 1
 Byblus, D 3
 Caspian Sea, G 1, 2
 Cataracts on the Nile, C 4, 5, 6
 Crete, AB 2
 Cyprus, C 2, 3
 Cyrene, A 3
 Damascus, D 3
 Darfur, AB 7
 Euphrates, R, EF 3
 Gem Atan, C 5
 Hahopolis, C 3
 Hittites, CD 2
 Jerusalem, D 3
 Kottia, B 2
 Khartoum, C 6
 Khartoum, C 1
 Khartoum, R, CD 1
 Khartoum, S 6
 Leucos Limen, C 4
 Libyan Desert, AB 4, 5
 Libyans, A 3
 Maghara, Wadi, D 4
 'Marishes, The', EF 2
 Maxyes (Meahweh), A 3
 Memphis, C 4
 Meros, C 6
 Meahweh (Maxyes), A 3
 Napata, C 6
 Nile Cataracts, C 4, 5, 6
 Nile, White and Blue, C 7
 Nineveh, E 2
 Oases Magna, C 4
 Oases Parva, B 4
 Oases Suat, C 4
 Oases Suwa, B 4
 Paracetomum, B 3, 4
 Punt, E 7, 8
 Red Sea, CDE 4, 5, 6
 Rhinocolura, C 3
 Sarbüt el-Khâdem, C 4
 Sennar, C 7
 Sidon, D 3
 Sinai, C 4
 Soleb, C 5
 Somah Coast, F 7
 Syria or Zahi, D 2, 3
 Tehenu, BC 3
 Temeh, AB 3
 Thebes, C 4
 Tigris, R, F 3
 Tyre, D 3
 Zahi or Syria, D 2, 3



of the Pharaoh's favourites, and his generals were liberally rewarded with gifts of such slaves; but the larger number were employed on the temple estates, the Pharaoh's domains, or in the construction of his great monuments and buildings, especially the last, a custom which continued until Saladin built the cathedral at Cairo with the labour of the Christian knights whom he captured from the ranks of the Crusaders. We shall see later how this captive labour transformed Thebes.

With the next campaign but six months distant, the return of the king every autumn, under such circumstances, began for him a winter in Egypt, if not so arduous, at least as busily occupied as the campaigning season in Asia. Shortly after his return in October, Thutmose made a tour of inspection throughout Egypt, closely questioning the local authorities wherever he landed, for the purpose of suppressing corruption in the local administration during the collection of taxes. On these journeys, too, he had opportunity of observing the progress of the noble temple buildings which he was either erecting, restoring or adorning at over thirty different places of which we know, and many more which have perished. He revived the Delta, neglected since Hyksos times, and from there to the third cataract his buildings were rising, strung like gems along the river. Returning to Thebes his interests were wide and his power was felt in every avenue of administration. The increasing wealth of the Amon temple demanded reorganization of its management, which the king accomplished personally, giving the priests careful regulations for the conduct of the state temple and its growing fortune. As the fruit of a moment's respite from the cares of state, he even handed to his chief of artificers in the royal workshops designs sketched by his own royal hand for vessels which he desired for the temple service. Thutmose himself thought sufficiently well of this accomplishment to have it noted over a relief depicting these vessels on the temple walls at Karnak; while in the opinion of the official who received the commission it was a fact so remarkable that he had the execution of these vessels by his artificers shown in the paintings on the walls of his tomb-chapel. Both these evidences of Thutmose's restless versatility still survive at Thebes. The great state-temple received another pylon on the south, and the whole mass of Karnak buildings, with the adjoining grove and garden, was given unity by an enclosure wall, with which Thutmose surrounded them.

The spring of the thirty-fourth year found Thutmose again in Zahi on his *ninth campaign*; for the advancement of Egypt's

Asiatic frontier to the Euphrates was, in the light of past experience, not an achievement from which he might expect lasting results. Some disaffection, probably in the Lebanon region, obliged him to take three towns in which considerable spoil was captured. This year evidently saw the extension of his power in the south also; for he secured the son of the chief of Irem, the neighbour of Punt, as a hostage. But, on the other hand, it was now nearly two years since he had seen Naharin and in so short a time its princes had ceased to fear his power. They formed a powerful and far-reaching coalition, with a prince at its head, whom Thutmose's Annals call 'that wretched foe of Naharin,' probably meaning the king of Mitanni. Thutmose's continual state of preparation enabled him to appear promptly on the plains of Naharin in the spring of the year thirty-five on his *tenth campaign*. He engaged the allies in battle at a place called Araina, which we are unable to locate with certainty, but it was probably somewhere in the Lower Orontes valley. 'Then his majesty prevailed against these barbarians...they fled headlong, falling one over another before his majesty.' The alliance of the Naharin dynasts was completely shattered and its resources for future resistance destroyed or carried off by the victorious Egyptians. Far as were these Syrian princes from Egypt, they had learned the length and the might of the Pharaoh's arm, and it was seven years before they again revolted:

We know nothing of the objective of Thutmose's eleventh and twelfth campaigns; but the year thirty-eight found him again in the southern Lebanon region on his *thirteenth campaign*, while the turbulent Bedouins of southern Palestine forced him to march through their country the very next year. He then spent the rest of this *fourteenth campaign* in Syria, where it became merely a tour of inspection; but in both years he kept the harbours supplied as before, ready for every emergency. The tribute seems to have come in regularly for the next two years (forty and forty-one), and again the king of 'Kheta the great' sent gifts, which Thutmose as before records among the 'tribute.'

Egyptian supremacy in Asia, however, was not to be accepted by the princes of Syria without one more despairing effort to achieve independence. Incited by Kadesh, Thutmose's inveterate enemy, they again rose in a final united effort to shake off the Pharaoh's strong hand. All Naharin, especially the king of Tunip, and also some of the northern coast cities, had been induced to join the alliance. The great king was now an old man, probably over seventy years of age, but with his accustomed promptitude

he appeared with his fleet off the coast of northern Syria in the spring of the year forty-two. It was his last campaign¹. Like his first it was directed against his arch-enemy, Kadesh. Instead of approaching the place from the south, as before, Thutmose determined to isolate her from her northern support and to capture Tunip first. He therefore landed at some point between the mouth of the Orontes and the Eleutherus, whence he marched against Tunip. He was detained at Tunip until the harvest season, but he captured the place after a short resistance. He then accomplished the march up the Orontes to Kadesh without mishap and wasted the towns of the region. The king of Kadesh engaged the Egyptians in battle before the city, and in the effort to make headway against Thutmose's seasoned troops the Syrian king resorted to a stratagem. He sent forth a mare against the Egyptian chariotry, hoping thus to excite the stallions and produce confusion, or even a break in the Egyptian battle-line, of which he might take advantage. But Thutmose's veteran general, Amenemhab, leaped from his chariot, sword in hand, pursued the mare on foot, ripped her up and cut off her tail, which he carried in triumph to the king. After a short investment, the powerful city was taken by assault. The Naharin auxiliaries who were aiding in the defence fell into Thutmose's hands, and it was not even necessary for him to march into the north. With the fall of Kadesh disappeared the last vestige of the Hyksos power which had once subdued Egypt, a catastrophe of such impressiveness that it was long remembered. Even the tradition of late Greek days made Thutmose III the conqueror of the Hyksos². Indeed Thutmose's name became proverbial in Asia, and when, four generations later, his successors failed to shield their faithful vassals in Naharin from the aggressions of the Kheta, the forsaken unfortunates remembered Thutmose's great name, and wrote pathetically to Egypt: 'Who formerly could have plundered Tunip without being plundered by Manakhbiria (Thutmose III)?' But even now, at three score and ten or more, the indomitable old warrior had the harbours equipped with the

¹ According to Sethe's new collation of Thutmose III's Annals, there is some doubt about his having made a campaign in the year forty, and there was probably no campaign of the year forty-one. The last campaign may therefore have been the sixteenth or even the fifteenth. (See Sethe, *Urkunden*, iv, 726-729.)

² There can be no serious doubt that Ἀλίσφραγμούθωσις of Josephus (*Contra Apion*, i, 14), which is a corruption of Μισφραγμούθωσις (Africanus, Syncellus; 70, 130), is to be identified with the two cartouche-names of Thutmose III.

necessary supplies, and there is little doubt that if it had been necessary he would have led his army into Syria again. Once more he received the envoys of the tribute-paying princes in his tent, and then for the last time he returned to Egypt.

In concluding his wars in Asia Thutmose was relinquishing what had become a seemingly permanent organization, for his campaigning was now as thoroughly organized as the administration at Thebes. As soon as the spring rains in Syria and Palestine had ceased, he had regularly disembarked his troops in some Phoenician or north Syrian harbour. Here his permanent officials had effected the collection of the necessary stores from the neighbouring dynasts, who were compelled to furnish them. His palace-herald, or marshal, Intef, who was of the old princely line of Thinis, and still held his title as 'count of Thinis and lord of the entire oasis-region,' had accompanied him on all his marches; and as Thutmose advanced inland Intef preceded him until the proximity of the enemy prevented. Whenever he reached a town in which the king was expected to spend the night, he sought out the palace of the local dynast and prepared it for Thutmose's reception. One is reminded of the regular and detailed preparation of Napoleon's tent, which he always found awaiting him after his day's march, as he rode into the quarters each night. Had it been preserved, the life of these warriors of Thutmose would form a stirring chapter in the history of the Ancient East. The career of his general, Amenemhab, who cut off the elephant's trunk and rescued the king, is but a hint of the life of the Pharaoh's followers in bivouac and on battlefield, crowded to the full with perilous adventure and hard-won distinction. The fame of these tried veterans of Thutmose, of course, found its way among the common people and many a stirring adventure from the Syrian campaigns took form in folk-tales, told with eager interest in the market-places and the streets of Thebes. A lucky chance has rescued one of these tales on a page or two of papyrus. It concerns one Thutiy, a great general of Thutmose, and his clever capture of the city of Joppa by introducing his picked soldiers into the town, concealed in panniers, borne by a train of donkeys, an incident long afterward reappearing in 'Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves.' But Thutiy was not a creation of fancy; his tomb, though now unknown, must still exist somewhere in Thebes, for it was plundered many years ago by the natives, who took from it some of the rich gifts which Thutmose gave him as a reward for his valour. A splendid golden dish, which found its way into the Louvre, bears the words: 'Given as a distinction from king

Thutmose to the prince and priest who satisfies the king in every country, and the isles in the midst of the sea, filling the treasury with lapis lazuli, silver and gold, the governor of countries, commander of the army, favourite of the king, the king's scribe, Thutiy.'

Had the great king's Annals survived intact we could have followed step by step the entire course of his campaigns; for a record of every day's happenings was carefully kept by one Thaneni, a scribe appointed for the purpose by Thutmose. Thaneni tells us of his duties with great pride, saying: 'I followed king Thutmose; I beheld the victories of the king which he won in every country....I recorded the victories which he won in every land, putting them into writing according to the facts.' These records of Thaneni were seemingly rolls of leather, but they have perished and we have upon the walls at Karnak only the capricious extracts of a temple scribe, more anxious to set forth the spoil and Amon's share therein than to perpetuate the story of his king's great deeds. How much he has passed over, the biography of Amenemhab shows only too well; and thus all that we have of the wars of Egypt's greatest commander has filtered through the shrivelled soul of an ancient bureaucrat, who little dreamed how hungrily future ages would ponder his meagre excerpts.

Having at last established the sovereignty of Egypt in Asia on a permanent basis, Thutmose could now turn his attention to Nubia. It is evident that Menkheperreseneb, the head of his gold and silver treasury, was now receiving thence six to eight hundred pounds of gold every year. The king also organized the neighbouring gold country on the Coptos road and put it under a 'governor of the gold country of Coptos.' His viceroy, Nehi, had now been administering Kush for twenty years and had placed the productivity of the country on a high plane; but it was the desire of the great king to extend still farther his dominions in the south. In his last years his buildings show that he was extremely active throughout the province; as far as the third cataract we trace his temples at Kalabsheh, Amada, Wadi Halfa, Kummeh and Semneh, where he restored the temple of his great ancestor Sesostri III, and at Soleb. We learn, through the clearance of the canal at the first cataract in the fiftieth year, that an expedition of his was then returning from a campaign against the Nubians. There must have been earlier expeditions also in the same region, for Thutmose was able to record in duplicate upon the pylons of his Karnak temple a list of one hundred and fifteen places which

he had conquered in Nubia and another containing some four hundred such names. The geography of Nubia is too little known to enable us to locate the territory represented, and it is uncertain exactly how far up the Nile his new frontier may have been, but it was doubtless in the region of the fourth cataract, where we find it under his son.

As he felt his strength failing, the great king made co-regent his son, Amenhotep II, born to him by Hatshepsut-Meretre, a queen of whose origin we know nothing. It was twelve years since he had returned from his last campaign in Asia. When the co-regency had lasted for about a year, in the spring of the year 1447 B.C.¹, when he was within five weeks of the end of his fifty-fourth year upon the throne, the greatest of the Egyptian conquerors passed away. He was buried in his tomb in the Valley of the Kings by his son, and his body still survives.

The character of Thutmose III stands forth with more of colour and individuality than that of any king of early Egypt, except Ikhnaton. We see the man of a tireless energy unknown in any Pharaoh before or since; the man of versatility, designing exquisite vases in a moment of leisure; the lynx-eyed administrator, who launched his armies upon Asia with one hand and with the other crushed the extortionate tax-gatherer. His vizier, Rekhmire, who stood closest to his person, says of him: 'Lo, his majesty was one who knew what happened; there was nothing of which he was ignorant; he was Thoth (the god of knowledge) in everything; there was no matter which he did not carry out.' While he was proud to leave a record of his unparalleled achievements, Thutmose protests more than once his deep respect for the truth in so doing. 'I have not uttered exaggeration,' says he, 'in order to boast of that which I did, saying, "I have done something," although my majesty had not done it. I have not done anything ...against which contradiction might be uttered. I have done this for my father, Amon...because he knoweth heaven and he knoweth earth, he seeth the whole earth hourly.'

It is quite evident, indeed, that the reign of Thutmose III marks an epoch not only in Egypt but in the whole Near East as we know it in his age. Never before in history had a single brain wielded the resources of so great a nation and wrought them into such centralized, permanent, and at the same time mobile efficiency, that for years they could be brought to bear with incessant impact upon another continent as a skilled artisan

¹ In accordance with Sethe's view of the New Moon dates mentioned in footnote, p. 67, this date would be three years earlier.

manipulates a hundred-ton forge hammer; although the figure is inadequate unless we remember that Thutmose forged his own hammer. The genius which rose from an obscure priestly office to accomplish this for the first time in history reminds us of a Napoleon. He was the first to build an empire in any real sense; he was the first world-hero. He made, not only a world-wide impression upon his age, but an impression of a new order. His commanding figure, towering over the trivial plots and schemes of the petty Syrian dynasts, must have clarified the atmosphere of oriental politics as a strong wind drives away miasmatic vapours. The inevitable chastisement of his strong arm was held in awed remembrance by the men of Naharin for three generations. His name was one to conjure with, and centuries after his empire had crumbled to pieces it was placed on amulets as a word of power. And to-day two of this king's greatest monuments, his Heliopolitan obelisks, now rise on opposite shores of the western ocean, memorials of the world's first empire-builder.

CHAPTER V

THE ZENITH OF EGYPTIAN POWER AND THE REIGN OF AMENHOTEP III

I. EGYPT MISTRESS OF THE EAST

EGYPT had now become the controlling power in the far-reaching group of civilizations clustering in and about the eastern end of the Mediterranean, the centre, perhaps the nucleus, of the civilized world of that day. As she had been for over two thousand years the dominant civilizing force in the great complex of eastern Mediterranean states, so she was now likewise its political arbiter and economic centre. Seated astride both the inter-continental and the inter-oceanic highway, Egypt was building up and dominating the world of contiguous Africa and Eurasia. Traditional limits disappeared, the currents of life eddied no longer within the landmarks of tiny kingdoms, but pulsed from end to end of a great empire, embracing many kingdoms and tongues, from the upper Nile to the upper Euphrates. The wealth of Asiatic trade, circulating through the eastern end of the Mediterranean, which once flowed down the Euphrates to Babylon, was thus diverted to the Nile Delta, long before united by canal with the Red Sea. All the world traded in the Delta markets. Assyria was still in her infancy and Babylonia no longer possessed any political influence in the west. The Pharaoh looked forward to an indefinite lease of power throughout the vast empire which he had conquered.

The administration and organization of this Empire represent the earliest efforts of a government to devise an imperial system. Our scanty sources reveal little regarding it. The whole region of neighbouring Asia was under the general control of a 'governor of the north countries': Thutmose's general, Thutiy, having been the first to hold that office. To bridle the turbulent Asiatic dynasts it was necessary permanently to station troops throughout Syria. Strongholds named after the Pharaoh were established and troops placed in them as garrisons under deputies with power to act as the Pharaoh's representatives. Thutmose III erected one such at the south end of Lebanon; he resuscitated another founded by his predecessors at some city on the Phoenician coast, where

we find a sanctuary of Amon, the State-god of Egypt, and there was probably such a temple in each of the garrison towns. Yet another stronghold at Ikathi, in farthest Naharin, was doubtless his foundation. Remains of an Egyptian temple found by Renan at Byblus probably belong to this period. In local administration the city-kings were allowed to rule their little states with great freedom, as long as they paid the annual tribute with promptness and regularity. When such a ruler died his son, who, as already noted, had been educated at Thebes, was installed in the father's place. The Asiatic conquests were therefore rather a series of tributary kingdoms than provinces: the latter, indeed, represent a system of foreign government as yet in its infancy, or only roughly foreshadowed in the rule of the viceroy of Kush. How the local government of the city-kings was related to the administration of the 'governor of the north countries' is entirely uncertain. Apparently his office was largely a fiscal one, for Thutiy, Thutmose's governor, adds to his name the phrase 'filling the treasury with lapis lazuli, silver and gold.' But it is evident that the dynasts collected their own taxes and rendered a part to the Pharaoh. How large a part this may have been we do not know; nor have we the slightest idea as to the amount of the Pharaoh's total revenue from Asia.

When the news of Thutmose III's death reached Asia the opportunity was as usual improved by the dynasts, who made every preparation to throw off the irksome obligation of the annual tribute. All Naharin, including the Mitanni princes, and probably also the northern coast cities, were combined or at least simultaneous in the uprising. With all his father's energy the young Amenhotep II prepared for the crisis and marched into Asia against the allies, who had collected a large army. Leaving Egypt with his forces in the April of his second year (1447 B.C.), Amenhotep was in touch with the enemy in northern Palestine in early May and immediately fought an action at Shemesh-Edom against the princes of Lebanon. The enemy was routed. By May 12 he had crossed the Orontes for the last time in his northward advance, probably at Senzar, and turned north-eastward for the Euphrates. After a skirmish with the Naharin vanguard he pushed rapidly on and captured seven of the rebellious dynasts in the land of Tikhshi. On May 26, fourteen days after leaving the Orontes, he arrived at Niy, which opened its gates to him; and with the men and women of the town acclaiming him from the walls he entered the place in triumph. Ten days later, on June 5, he had rescued a garrison of his troops from the treachery

of the revolting town of Ikathi and punished its inhabitants. As he reached his extreme limit, which probably surpassed his father's, and penetrated Mitanni, he set up a boundary tablet, as his father and grandfather had done.

His return was a triumphal procession. As he approached Memphis, the populace assembled in admiring crowds while his lines passed, driving with them over five hundred of the north Syrian lords, two hundred and forty of their women, two hundred and ten horses and three hundred chariots. His herald had in charge for the chief treasurer over four-fifths of a ton of gold in the form of vases and various vessels, besides nearly fifty tons of copper. Proceeding to Thebes, he took with him the seven kings of Tikhshi, who were hung head downward on the prow of his royal barge as he approached the city. He himself sacrificed them in the presence of Amon and hanged their bodies on the walls of Thebes, reserving one for a lesson to the Nubians, as we shall see. His unexpected promptness and energy had evidently crushed the revolt before it had been able to muster all its forces, and so far as we know, the lesson was so effective that no further rising against his suzerainty in Asia was ever attempted. Nevertheless, so customary had the practice of war become in the career of a Pharaoh that Amenhotep's records refer to the expedition as 'his first campaign,' although no second campaign in Asia is known to us.

On his arrival at Thebes the young Pharaoh could now direct his attention to the other extremity of his empire. He dispatched an expedition into Nubia, bearing the body of the seventh king of the land of Tikhshi, which was hung up on the walls of Napata, as a hint of what the Nubians might expect should they attempt to revolt against their new sovereign. His frontier was guarded by Napata, just below the fourth cataract, and the region of Karoy, in which the town lay, was from this time on known as the southern limit of Egyptian administration. To this point extended the jurisdiction of the 'viceroy of Kush and governor of the south countries.' The entire fertile Dongola province of to-day was thus included in the Egyptian administration. Beyond Amenhotep's boundary tablets which he set up at this southern frontier, there was no more control of the rude Nubian tribes than was necessary to keep open the trade-routes from the south and prevent the barbarians from raiding the province.

Thenceforward Amenhotep II was not involved in war. Besides his now vanished mortuary temple on the west side of the Nile, by that of his father, we learn of a number of other

sumptuous buildings and restorations. We are able to discern little of him personally, but he seems to have been a worthy son of the great king. Physically he was a very powerful man and claims in his inscriptions that no man could draw his bow. The weapon was found in his tomb and bears the words after his name: 'Smiter of the Troglodytes, overthrower of Kush, hacking up their cities...the great Wall of Egypt, protector of his soldiers.' It is evidently this story which furnished Herodotus with the legend that Cambyzes was unable to draw the bow of the king of Ethiopia. He celebrated his jubilee on the thirtieth anniversary of his appointment as crown prince and erected an obelisk in Elephantine in commemoration of the event. Dying about 1420 B.C., after a reign of some twenty-seven years, he was interred like his ancestors in the Valley of the Kings' Tombs, where his body rests to this day, though even yet a prey to the clever tomb-robbers of modern Thebes, who in November, 1901, forced the tomb and cut through the wrappings of the mummy in their search for royal treasure on the body of their ancient ruler. Their Theban ancestors in the same craft, however, had three thousand years ago taken good care that nothing should be left for their descendants.

If we may believe a folk-tale which was in circulation some centuries later, Thutmose IV, Amenhotep II's son, was not at first designed to be his father's successor. The story recounted how, long before his father's death, a hunting expedition once carried the young prince into the desert near the pyramids of Gizeh, where the Pharaohs of the IVth Dynasty had already slept over thirteen hundred years. Resting in the shadow of the great Sphinx at noon time, he fell asleep, and the Sun-god, with whom the Sphinx in his time was identified, appeared to him in a dream, beseeching him to clear his image of the sand which already at that early day encumbered it. As a reward the Sun-god at the same time promised him the kingdom. The prince made a vow to do as the great god desired, and immediately upon his accession the young king hastened to redeem his vow. He cleared the gigantic figure of the Sphinx and recorded the whole incident on a stela in the vicinity. A later version, made by the priests of the palace, was engraved on a huge granite architrave taken from the neighbouring Khafre temple and erected against the breast of the Sphinx between his fore-legs, where it still stands.

Thutmose IV was also early called upon to maintain the empire in Asia. While we know nothing of his operations there, he was afterward able to record in the state temple at Thebes the spoil, 'which his majesty captured in Naharin the wretched, on his

first victorious campaign.' The immediate result of his appearance in Naharin was to quiet all disaffection there as far as the vassal-princes were concerned. He returned by way of Lebanon, where he forced the chiefs to furnish him with a cargo of cedar for the sacred barge of Amon at Thebes. Arriving at Thebes, he settled a colony of the prisoners, possibly from the city of Gezer in Palestine, in the enclosure of his mortuary temple, which he had erected by those of his ancestors on the plain at Thebes. Perhaps the recognition of a common enemy in the Kheta now necessitated a *rapprochement* between the Pharaoh and Mitanni, for the latter was soon to suffer from the aggressions of the king of Kheta (the Hittites). Thutmose, evidently desiring a powerful friend in the north, inaugurated an entirely new Egyptian policy on the northern frontier of the Asiatic empire, viz. that of alliance with a leading and once hostile power. It was a good policy but its success depended upon the wisdom with which the Asiatic ally was chosen. Thutmose IV was not wholly successful in his selection. What he knew of the Kheta we cannot now determine. He chose as his northern ally Artatama, the Mitannian king, and sending to him, desired his daughter in marriage. After some proper display of reluctance, Artatama consented, and the Mitannian princess was sent to Egypt, where she probably received an Egyptian name, Mutemuya, and became the mother of the next king of Egypt, Amenhotep III. This alliance with Mitanni forbade all thought of future conquest by the Pharaoh east of the Euphrates¹, and in harmony with this policy a friendly alliance was also cemented with Babylonia.

Thutmose's momentous operations in Asia were followed by a brief war in Nubia in his eighth year, which it is probable he did not long survive. He was therefore unable to beautify Thebes and adorn the state temple as his fathers had done. But the respect in which he held his grandfather, Thutmose III, led him to the completion of a notable work of the latter. For thirty-five years the last obelisk planned by Thutmose III had been lying unfinished at the southern portal of the Karnak temple enclosure or temenos. His grandson now had it engraved in the old conqueror's name, recorded also upon it his own pious deed in continuing the work, and erected the colossal shaft, one hundred and

¹ On the basis of a decorative list of foreign countries shown as captives on the bases of the columns in Amenhotep III's Soleb temple, it has sometimes been supposed that this Pharaoh ruled the lands of Mesopotamia; but the Amarna Letters are quite decisive on this point, the Egyptian empire never included Mesopotamia.

five-and-a-half feet high, the largest surviving obelisk, at the southern portal of the enclosure, where he had found it lying. It now stands before the Lateran in Rome. Not long after this gracious act, which may possibly have been in celebration of his own jubilee, Thutmose IV was gathered to his fathers (about 1411 B.C.) and was buried in the valley where they slept.

His son, the third of the Amenhoteps, was the most luxurious and splendid, as he was also the last, of the great Egyptian emperors. He was but the great-grandson of Thutmose III, but with him the high tide of Egyptian power was already slowly on the ebb, and he was not the man to stem the tide. Nevertheless in the administration of his great empire Amenhotep III began well. Toward the close of his fourth year trouble in Nubia called him south. After defeating the enemy decisively somewhere above the second cataract, Amenhotep marched southward for a month, taking captives and spoil as he went. It is difficult to determine the exact limit of his southern advance. In the land of Karoy, with which the reader is now acquainted as the region about Napata, he collected great quantities of gold for his Theban buildings, and at Kebehu-Hor, or 'the Pool of Horus,' he erected his tablet of victory, but we are unable to locate the place with certainty. It was certainly not much in advance of the frontier of his father. This was the last great invasion of Nubia by the Pharaohs. It was constantly necessary to punish the outlying tribes for their incessant predatory incursions into the Nile valley; but the valley itself, as far as the fourth cataract, was completely subjugated, and as far as the second cataract largely Egyptianized. This process went steadily forward until the country up to the fourth cataract was effectually engrafted with Egyptian civilization. Egyptian temples had now sprung up at every larger town, and the Egyptian gods were worshipped therein; the Egyptian arts were learned by the Nubian craftsmen, and everywhere the rude barbarism of the upper Nile was receiving the stamp of Egyptian culture. Nevertheless the native chieftains, under the surveillance of the viceroy, were still permitted to retain their titles and honours, and doubtless continued to enjoy at least a nominal share in the government. We find them as far north as Ibrim, which had marked the southern limit of Amenhotep III's levy of Nubian auxiliaries, and was therefore probably the extreme point to which local administration solely by Egyptian officials extended southward. In race it should be noted that the population of these regions ruled by Egypt on the upper Nile was composed of Nubians, not of negroes. While some negroes

filtered into the southern Nubian provinces of Egypt, the Egyptian frontier at the fourth cataract evidently did not include any negro territory, which was at that time, as at present, well south of the fourth cataract. The first appearance of real negroes on the Egyptian monuments, that is, their first appearance in history, is, as H. Junker has argued, to be dated in the Egyptian empire, beginning with the age of Thutmose III; but even the empire never included any exclusively negro territory.

In Asia Amenhotep III enjoyed unchallenged supremacy; at the court of Babylon, even, his suzerainty in 'Canaan,' as they called Syria-Palestine, was acknowledged; and when the dynasts attempted to involve Kurigalzu, king of Babylon, in an alliance with them against the Pharaoh, he wrote them an unqualified refusal, stating that he was in alliance with the Pharaoh, and even threatened them with hostilities if they formed a hostile alliance against Egypt (see p. 232). All the powers: Babylonia, Assyria, Mitanni and Alashiya (? Cyprus), were exerting every effort to gain the friendship of Egypt. A scene of world politics, such as is unknown before in history, now unfolds before us. From the Pharaoh's court as the centre radiated a host of lines of communication with all the great peoples of the age. These are revealed to us in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, perhaps the most interesting mass of documents surviving from the early East (see below, p. 128). In this correspondence we look out across the kingdoms of Hither Asia as one might see them on a stage, each king playing his part before the great throne of the Pharaoh. Five letters survive from the correspondence between Amenhotep III and Kadashman-Enlil, king of Babylonia; one from the Pharaoh and the others from the Babylonian. The latter is constantly in need of gold and insistently importunes his brother of Egypt to send him large quantities of the precious metal, which, he says, is as plentiful as dust in Egypt, according to the reports of the Babylonian messengers. Considerable friction results from the dissatisfaction of the Babylonian king at the amounts with which Amenhotep favours him. He refers to the fact that Amenhotep had received from his father a daughter in marriage, and makes this relationship a reason for further gifts of gold. As the correspondence goes on another marriage is negotiated between a daughter of Amenhotep and Kadashman-Enlil or his son. Similarly the Pharaoh enjoys the most intimate connection with Shuttarna, the king of Mitanni, the son of Artatama, with whom his father, Thutmose IV, had maintained the most cordial relations. Indeed Amenhotep was perhaps the nephew of Shuttarna, from whom, in the tenth year of

the Pharaoh's reign, he received a daughter, Gilukhipa, in marriage (p. 300). In celebration of this union Amenhotep issued a series of scarab-beetles of stone bearing an inscription commemorating the event, and stating that the princess brought with her a train of three hundred and seventeen ladies and attendants. On the death of Shuttarna the alliance was continued under his son, Tushratta, from whom Amenhotep later received, as a wife for his son and successor, a second Mitannian princess, Tadukhipa, the daughter of Tushratta. The correspondence between the two kings is very illuminating and may serve as an example of such communications. The following is a letter of Tushratta to his Egyptian ally (No. xix):

Speak unto Nimuria (*i.e.* Amenhotep III), the great king, the king of Egypt, my brother, my son-in-law, who loves me and whom I love, saying: Tushratta, the great king, thy father-in-law, who loves thee, the king of Mitanni, thy brother. It is well with me. With thee may it be well, with thy house, with my sister and with the rest of thy wives, thy sons, thy chariots, thy horses, thy army, thy land, and all thy possessions, may it be very well indeed. In the time of thy fathers, they were on very friendly terms with my fathers. Now thou hast increased (this friendship) still more and with my father thou hast been on very friendly terms indeed. Now, therefore, since thou and I are on mutually friendly terms, thou hast made (it) ten times greater than (with) my father. May the gods cause this friendship of ours to prosper. May Teshub (the god of Mitanni), my lord, and Amon eternally proclaim it as it is now.

And when my brother sent his messenger, Mane, my brother verily said: 'Send me thy daughter for my wife, to be queen of Egypt.' I did not grieve the heart of my brother, but I spoke formerly: 'I will indeed gratify (thee).' And the one my brother asked for I presented to Mane, and he looked upon her. When he saw her, he greatly —(?) Now may he bring her safely to my brother's land, and may Ishtar and Amon make her correspond to my brother's wish.

Gilia, my messenger, has brought to me my brother's words: when I heard them, then they seemed to me very good, and I was very glad indeed and said: 'It is inviolable (?) that we maintain friendship between us and with one another.' Behold, in view of these words, we will maintain friendship forever. Now when I wrote unto my brother and spoke, verily I said: 'We will be very friendly indeed, and between us we shall be good friends'; and I said to my brother: 'Let my brother grant me ten times greater measure than to my father,' and I asked of my brother a great deal of gold, saying: 'Much more than to my father let my brother give me and may my brother send me. Thou sentest my father a great deal of gold: a large offering vessel of gold, and vessels of gold, thou serdest him; thou sentest (him?) a tablet of gold as if it were alloyed with copper.... So let my brother send gold in very great quantity which cannot be counted,... and may my brother send more gold than my father received. For in my brother's land gold is as common as dust.'


In response to similar entreaties, Amenhotep sent a gift of twenty talents of gold to the king of Assyria, and gained his friendship also. The vassalship of the king of Alashiya continued, and he regularly sent the Pharaoh large quantities of copper, save when on one occasion he excused himself because his country had been visited by a pestilence. So complete was the understanding between Egypt and this land that even the extradition of the property of one of its citizens who had died in Egypt was regarded by the two kings as a matter of course, and a messenger was sent to Egypt to receive the property and bring it back for delivery to the wife and son of the deceased. Thus courted and flattered, the object of diplomatic attention from all the great powers, Amenhotep found little occasion for anxiety regarding his Asiatic empire.

The Syrian vassals were now the grandsons of the men whom Thutmose III had conquered; they had grown thoroughly habituated to the Egyptian allegiance. It was not without its advantages in rendering them free from all apprehension of attack from without. An Egyptian education at the Pharaoh's capital had, moreover, made him many a loyal servant among the children of the dynasts, who had succeeded disloyal or lukewarm fathers in Syria. They protest their fidelity to the Pharaoh on all occasions; they inform the court at the first sign of disloyalty among their fellows, and are even commissioned to proceed against rebellious princes. Throughout the land in the larger cities are garrisons of Egyptian troops, consisting of infantry and chariotry. They are no longer solely native Egyptians, but to a large extent Nubians and Sherden, roving, predatory bands of sea-robbers, perhaps the ancestors of the Sardinians, though their name has also been associated with Sardes (see p. 282). From now on they took service in the Egyptian army in ever larger and larger numbers. These forces of the Pharaoh were maintained by the dynasts, and one of their self-applied tests of loyalty in writing to the Pharaoh was, as we frequently learn, their readiness and faithfulness in furnishing supplies. Syria thus enjoyed a stability of government and widespread public security such as had never before been hers. The roads were safe from robbers, caravans were convoyed from vassal to vassal, and a word from the Pharaoh was sufficient to bring any of his subject-princes to his knees. Amenhotep himself was never obliged to carry on a war in Asia. It was deemed sufficient, as we shall later see, to send troops under the command of an efficient officer, who found no difficulty in coping with the situation for a generation after Amenhotep's accession. See further, pp. 107, 123 *sqq.*

THE ASIATIC EMPIRE OF EGYPT

INDEX TO NAMES

| | |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| Abel, D 5 | Kadesh (on the Orontes), E 5 |
| Abel, D 7 | Karkar (Qarqar), E 4 |
| Abel, D 4 | Katna, Katna, E 5 |
| Abel, D 3 | Kebir, Nahr el, E 5 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Lachish, C 8 |
| Abel, D 3 | Lebanon, D 5, E 4, 5 |
| Abel, D 3 | Litany, R, D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Megiddo, D 7 |
| Abel, D 3 | Mitanni, G 3 |
| Abel, D 3 | Moab, D 8 9 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Naharm, E 4-H 3 |
| Abel, D 3 | Niy, G 4 |
| Abel, D 3 | Nuges, D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Othu (see Uthi Map 3) D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Qarqar, E 4 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Riblah (for Riblah), E 5 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Sam'al, F 2 |
| Abel, D 3 | Sar, CD 9 |
| Abel, D 3 | Senzar, E 4 |
| Abel, D 3 | Sharuben, C 8 |
| Abel, D 3 | Shunem, D 7 |
| Abel, D 3 | Sidon, D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | Smyra, E 5 |
| Abel, D 3 | Socoh, D 8 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Taanach, D 7 |
| Abel, D 3 | Tharu, B 9 |
| Abel, D 3 | Tump, E 4 |
| Abel, D 3 | Tyre, D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Ubi, E 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | Ugarit, DE 3 |
| Abel, D 3 | Ullaza, D 3 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Wan, Hight of, E 3 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Yehem, D 7 |
| Abel, D 3 | Yehoam, D 6 |
| Abel, D 3 | Yerasa, D 8 |
| Abel, D 3 | |
| Abel, D 3 | Zajzail, E 3 |



Trade now developed as never before. The only foreign commerce of Egypt herself, which the monuments clearly disclose to us, was carried on by the Pharaohs themselves, reminding us of Solomon's trafficking as a horse-merchant and his ventures in partnership with Hiram of Tyre. But there is no reason to suppose that the Pharaohs made foreign merchandizing their own exclusive prerogative, though we shall probably never know how many great merchants of Egypt were able to follow the example of Hatshepsut and her royal predecessors, as far back as the Vth Dynasty, in their impressive voyages to Punt. It is evident that the Nile, from the Delta to the cataracts, was now alive with the freight of all the world, which flowed into it from the Red Sea fleets and from long caravans passing back and forth through the Isthmus of Suez, bearing the rich stuffs of Syria, the spices and aromatic woods of the east, the weapons and chased vessels of the Phoenicians, and a myriad of other things, which brought their Semitic names into the hieroglyphic and their use into the life of the Nile-dwellers. Parallel with the land traffic through the isthmus were the routes of commerce on the Mediterranean, thickly dotted with the richly laden galleys of Phoenicia, converging upon the Delta from all quarters and bringing to the markets of the Nile the decorated vessels or damascened bronzes from the Mycenaean industrial settlements of the Aegean. A tomb-painting of Egyptian Thebes shows us several Phoenician craft of Egyptian models tied up at Nile docks, with Syrian crews and merchants trafficking in the Egyptian bazaars. The products of Egyptian industry were likewise in use in the palace of the sea-kings of Cnossus, in Rhodes, and in Cyprus, where numbers of Pharaonic monuments of this age have been found. Scarabs and bits of glazed ware with the name of Amenhotep III or his queen Tiye have also been discovered on the mainland of Greece at Mycenae—the earliest dated tokens of high civilization on the continent of Europe. See vol. 1, p. 176.

The diffusion of Nile-valley civilization which had been going on from prehistoric times was now more rapid. The eastern Mediterranean peoples, especially, were feeling the impact of Egyptian culture. In Crete Egyptian religious forms had been introduced, in one case seemingly under the personal leadership of an Egyptian priest. Aegean artists were powerfully influenced by the incoming products of Egypt. Egyptian landscapes appear in their metal work, and the lithe animal forms in instantaneous postures which were caught by the pencil of the Theban artists were now common in Crete. The superb decorated ceilings of

Thebes likewise appear in the great tomb at Orchomenus. Even the pre-Greek writing of Crete shows traces of the influence of the hieroglyphics of the Nile. The men of the Aegean world, the men of Keftiu, who brought these things to their countrymen, were now a familiar sight upon the streets of Thebes, where the wares which they offered were also modifying the art of Egypt. The plentiful silver of the north now came in with the northern strangers in great quantities, and, although under the Hyksos the baser metal had been worth twice as much as gold, the latter now and permanently became the more valuable medium. The ratio was now about one and two-thirds to one, and the value of silver steadily fell until Ptolemaic times, when the ratio was twelve to one.

Such intercourse required protection and regulation. Roving bands of Lycian pirates infested the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean; they boldly entered the harbours of Alashiya and plundered the towns, and even landed on the coast of the Delta. Amenhotep III was therefore obliged to develop marine police which patrolled the coast of the Delta and constantly held the mouths of the river closed against all but lawful comers. Custom-houses were also maintained by these police officials at the same places, and all merchandise not consigned to the king was dutiable. The income from this source must have been large, but we have no means of estimating it. All the land-routes leading into the country were similarly policed, and foreigners who could not satisfactorily explain their business were turned back, while legitimate trade was encouraged, protected and properly taxed.

II. CIVILIZATION AND THE NEW AGE UNDER AMENHOTEP III

The influx of slaves, chiefly of Semitic race, which had begun under Thutmose III, still continued, and the king's chief scribe distributed them throughout the land and enrolled them among the tax-paying serfs. As this host of foreigners intermarried with the natives, the large infusion of strange blood began to make itself felt in a new and composite type of face, if we may trust the artists of the day. The incalculable wealth which had now been converging upon the coffers of the Pharaoh for over a century also began to exert a profound influence, which, as under like conditions, in later history, was far from wholesome. On New Year's Day the king presented his nobles with a profusion of

costly gifts which would have amazed the Pharaohs of the Pyramid Age. In the old days the monarch rewarded a faithful noble with land, which, in order to pay a return, must be properly cultivated and administered, thus fostering simplicity and wholesome country virtues on a large domain; but the favourite now received convertible wealth, which required no administration to be utilized. The luxury and display of the metropolis supplanted the old rustic simplicity and sturdy elemental virtues. From the Pharaoh down to the humblest scribe this change was evident, if in nothing else than the externals of costume; for the simple linen kilt from the hips to the knees, which once satisfied all, not excluding the king, had now given way to an elaborate costume, with long plaited skirt, and a rich tunic with flowing sleeves. Under Thutmose IV even the simple and long-revered Pharaonic costume had been displaced by an elaborate royal garment in the new mode. The unpretentious head-dress of the old time was replaced by an elaborately curled wig hanging down upon the shoulders; while the once bare feet were shod in elegant sandals, with tapering toes curled up at the tips. A noble of the landed class from the court of an Amenemhet or Senusret, could he have walked the streets of Thebes in Amenhotep III's day, would almost have been at a loss to know in what country he had suddenly found himself; while his own antiquated costume, which had survived only among the priests, would have awakened equal astonishment among the fashionable Thebans of the day. He would not have felt less strange than a noble of Elizabeth's reign in the streets of modern London. Cf. p. 421.

All about him he would have found elegant châteaux and luxurious villas, with charming gardens and summer-houses grouped about vast temples, such as the Nile-dweller had never seen before. The wealth and the captive labour of Asia and Nubia were being rapidly transmuted into noble architecture, and at Thebes a new and fundamental chapter in the history of the world's architecture was being daily written. Amenhotep gave himself with appreciation and enthusiasm to such works, and placed at the disposal of his architects all the resources which they needed for an ampler practice of their art than had ever before been possible. There were among them men of the highest gifts, and one of them, who bore the same name as the king, gained such a wide reputation for his wisdom that his sayings circulated in Greece some twelve hundred years later among the 'Proverbs of the Seven Wise Men'; and in Ptolemaic times he was finally worshipped as a god in the Ptah-temple of Karnak,

and took his place among the innumerable deities of Egypt as 'Amenhotep, son of Hapu.'

Under the fingers of such men as these the old and traditional elements of Egyptian building were imbued with new life and combined into new forms in which they took on a wondrous beauty unknown before. Besides this, the unprecedented resources of wealth and labour at the command of such an architect enabled him to deal with such vast dimensions that the element of size alone must have rendered his buildings in the highest degree impressive. But of the two forms of temple which now developed, the smaller is not less effective than the larger. It was a simple rectangular cella, or 'holy of holies,' of modest dimensions, with a door at each end, surrounded by a portico, the whole being raised upon a base of about half the height of the temple walls. With the door looking out between two graceful columns, and the façade happily set in the retreating vistas of the side colonnades, the whole is so successfully proportioned that the trained eye immediately recognizes the hand of a master who appreciated the full value of simple constructive lines. Indeed, the architects of Napoleon's expedition who brought it to the notice of the modern world were charmed with it, and thought that they had discovered in it the origin of the Greek peripteral temple. The other and larger type of temple, which now reached its highest development, differs strikingly from the one just discussed; and perhaps most fundamentally in the fact that its colonnades were all within and not visible from the outside. The 'holy of holies,' as of old, was surrounded by a series of chambers, larger than before, as rendered necessary by the rich and elaborate ritual which had arisen. Before it was a large colonnaded hall, often called the hypostyle, while in front of this hall lay an extensive forecourt surrounded by a columned portico. In front of this court rose two towers (together called a 'pylon'), which formed the façade of the temple. Their walls inclined inward, they were crowned by a hollow cornice, and the great door of the temple opened between them. While the masonry, which was of sandstone or limestone, did not usually contain large blocks, huge architraves, thirty or forty feet long and weighing one or two hundred tons, were not unknown. Nearly all the surfaces except those on the columns were embellished with flat reliefs, the outside walls showing the king in battle, while on the inside he appeared in the worship of the gods, and all surfaces with slight exception were highly coloured. Before the vast double doors of cedar of Lebanon, mounted in bronze, rose, one on either side, a pair of obelisks, towering high

above the pylon-towers; while colossal statues of the king, each hewn from a single block, were placed with backs to the pylon, on either side of the door. In the use of these elements and this general arrangement of the parts, already common before Amenhotep's reign, his architects created a radically new type, destined to survive in frequent use to this day as one of the noblest forms of architecture. Cf. p. 410.

At Luxor, the old southern suburb of Thebes, which had now grown into the city, there was a small XIIth Dynasty temple to Amon, in front of which Amenhotep planned a vast new sanctuary. Its great hall was laid out with a row of gigantic columns on either side of the central axis, quite surpassing in height any pier ever before employed by the Egyptians. Nor were they less beautiful for their great size, being masterpieces of proportion, with capitals of the graceful, spreading papyrus-flower type. These columns were higher than those ranged on both sides of the middle, thus producing a higher roof over the central aisle or nave and a lower roof over the side aisles, the difference in level being filled with tall grated stone windows, the whole forming a clerestory, which, it would seem, the Theban architects of Amenhotep III developed out of the light-chutes (the embryonic clerestory) of the Old Kingdom, already found some fifteen hundred years earlier at Gizeh. Thus were produced the fundamental elements in the basilica and cathedral architecture of Europe. Unfortunately the vast hall was unfinished at the death of the king, and his son was too ardent an enemy of Amon to carry out the work of his father. His later successors walled up the magnificent nave, using for this purpose some of the drums from the columns of the side aisles which were never set up, and the whole stands to-day a mournful wreck of an unfinished work of epoch-making importance in the history of architecture.

Discerning for the first time the possibilities of a monumental city—a city which should itself form a vast and symmetrically developed monument—Amenhotep now proceeded to give the great buildings of the city a unity which they had not before possessed. With the river as a great central avenue, the spacious temple precincts were ranged on both sides of the stately stream, while imposing avenues of sphinxes led down to either shore. The king also laid out a beautiful garden in the interval of over a mile and a half which separates the Karnak from the Luxor temple, and connected the great temples by avenues of rams carved in stone, each bearing a statue of the Pharaoh between the forepaws.

Nor did the western plain on the other side of the river, behind which the conquerors slept, suffer by comparison with the new glories of Karnak and Luxor. Along the foot of the rugged cliffs, from the modest chapel of Amenhotep I on the north, there stretched southward in an imposing line the mortuary temples of the emperors. At the south end of this line, but a little nearer the river, Amenhotep III erected his own mortuary sanctuary, the largest temple of his reign. Two gigantic colossi of the king, nearly seventy feet high, each cut from one block and weighing over seven hundred tons, besides a pair of obelisks, stood before the pylon, which was approached from the river by an avenue of jackals sculptured in stone. Numerous other great statues of the Pharaoh were ranged about the colonnades of the court. A huge stela of sandstone, thirty feet high, inwrought with gold and encrusted with costly stones, marked the ceremonial 'Station of the King,' where Amenhotep stood in performing the official duties of the ritual; another, over ten feet high, bore a record of all his works for Amon, while the walls and floors of the temple, overlaid with gold and silver, displayed the most prodigal magnificence. The fine taste and technical skill required for such supplementary works of the craftsman were now developed to a point of classical excellence, beyond which Egyptian art never passed. But this sumptuous building, probably the greatest work of art ever wrought in Egypt, has vanished utterly. Only the two weather-beaten colossi which guarded the entrance still look out across the plain, one of them still bearing the scribblings in Greek of curious tourists in the times of the Roman Empire who came to hear the marvellous voice of Memnon which issued from it every morning. A hundred paces behind lies prostrate and shattered in two the vast stela, once encrusted with gold and costly stones, marking the 'Station of the King,' and upon it one may still read the words of Amenhotep regarding the temple: 'My majesty has done these things for millions of years, and I know that they will abide in the earth.' We shall later have occasion to observe how this regal temple fell a prey to the impiety of Amenhotep's degenerate descendants within two hundred years of his death.

In the days of their splendour, the general effect of these Theban buildings must have been imposing in the extreme; the brilliant hues of the polychrome architecture, with columns and gates overwrought in gold, and floors overlaid with silver, the whole dominated by towering obelisks clothed in glittering metal, rising high above the rich green of the nodding palms and

tropical foliage which framed the mass—all this must have produced an impression both of gorgeous detail and overwhelming grandeur, of which the sombre ruins of the same buildings, impressive as they are, offer little hint at the present day. As at Athens in the days of her glory, the state was fortunate in the possession of men of sensitive and creative mind, upon whose quick imagination her greatness had profoundly wrought, until they were able to embody her external manifestations in forms of beauty, dignity and splendour. Thus had Thebes become a worthy seat of empire, the first monumental city of antiquity.

Under such conditions sculpture flourished as never before. Along with a tireless patience and nicety in the development of detail, the sculptor had at the same time gained a discernment of individual traits and a refinement of feeling, a delicacy and flexibility combined with strength, before unknown. These qualities were sometimes carried into work of such ample proportions that the sculptor's command of them under the circumstances is surprising, although not all of the colossal portrait statues are successful in these particulars. The success attained in the sculpture of impressive animal forms by the artists of this reign marked the highest level of such work in the history of Egyptian art, and Ruskin has insisted with his customary conviction that the two lions of Amenhotep III's reign now in the British Museum are the finest embodiment of animal majesty which have survived to us from any ancient people. Especially in relief were the artists of this age masters. In such works we may study the abandoned grief of the two sons of the High Priest of Memphis as they follow their father's body to the tomb, and note how effectively the artist has contrasted with their emotion the severe gravity and conventional decorum of the great ministers of state behind them, who themselves are again in striking contrast with a heartless Beau Brummell of that distant day, who is affectedly arranging the perfumed curls of his elaborate wig. The artist who wrought such a piece was a master of ripe and matured culture, an observer of life, whose work exhibits alike the pathos and the wistful questioning of human sorrow, recognizing both the necessity and the cruel indifference of official conventionality, and seeing, amid all, the play of the vain and ostentatious fashions of the hour. Such a work of art exhibits the same detachment and capacity to contemplate and criticize life, that had already arisen among the social thinkers of the Egyptian Feudal Age, and which some modern writers would have us believe first appeared in the literary art of Aristophanes.

Now, too, the Pharaoh's deeds of prowess inspired the sculptors of the time to design more elaborate compositions than they had ever before attempted. The battle scenes on the noble chariot of Thutmose IV exhibit an unprecedented complexity in drawing, and this tendency continued in the XIXth Dynasty.

We have already referred to the work of the craftsmen in furnishing and embellishing the temples. While the magnificent jewellery of the Middle Kingdom was never later surpassed, and possibly never equalled (p. 416 *sq.*), nevertheless the reign of Amenhotep III and his successor marked the Grand Age in all the refinements of artistic craftsmanship, especially as revealed in the palaces of the Pharaoh and the villas of his nobles. Such works as these, together with temples and gardens, made the western plain of Thebes a majestic prospect as the observer advanced from the river, ascending Amenhotep's avenue of sculptured jackals. On the left, behind the temple and nearer the cliffs, appeared a palace of the king, of rectangular wooden architecture in bright colours; very light and airy, and having over the front entrance a gorgeous cushioned balcony with graceful columns, in which the king showed himself to his favourites on occasion. Innumerable products of the industrial artists, which fill the museums of Europe, indicate with what tempered richness and delicate beauty such a royal chateau was furnished and adorned. Magnificent vessels in gold and silver, with figures of men and animals, plants and flowers rising from the brim, glittered on the king's table among crystal goblets, glass vases (made by the sons of the craftsmen who produced the earliest known glass vessels), and grey glazed bowls inlaid with pale blue designs. The walls were covered with woven tapestry which skilled judges have declared equal to the best modern work. Besides painted pavements depicting animal life, the walls also were adorned with blue glazed tiles, the rich colour of which shone through elaborate designs in gold leaf, while glazed figures were employed in encrusting larger surfaces. The ceilings were a deep blue sky across which floated soaring birds done in bright colours. Ceiling, walls and floor merged in a unified colour scheme which was developed with fine and intelligent consideration of the room as a whole. Of the painting of the time the best examples were in the palaces, but these buildings, being of wood and sun-dried brick, have perished. Enough has survived however to show us that in all the refined arts it was an age like that of Louis XV. It is evident that literature did not lag behind the other arts, but unhappily chance has preserved to us little of the literature of this remarkable age.

There is a triumphant hymn to Thutmose III, and we shall read portions of the remarkable Sun-hymn of Ikhnaton; but of narrative, song and legend, which must have flourished from the rise of the Empire, our surviving documents date almost exclusively from the XIXth Dynasty. The music of the period was more elaborate than ever before, for the art had made progress since the days of the old simplicity. The harp was now a huge instrument as tall as a man, and had some twenty strings; the lyre had been introduced from Asia, and the full orchestra contained the harp, the lyre, the lute and the double pipes.

In the midst of sumptuous splendour, such as no ruler of men had ever enjoyed before, this great emperor of the east devoted himself to his life of luxury and the beautification of his imperial city. Around his palace on the west side of the river he laid out an exclusive quarter which he gave to his queen, Tiy. He excavated a large lake in the enclosure, about a mile long and over a thousand feet wide, and at the celebration of his coronation anniversary in his twelfth year, he opened the sluices for filling it, and sailed out upon it in the royal barge with his queen, in such a gorgeous festival 'fantasia' as we find in the *Arabian Nights* in the days of the notorious Harun el-Rashid. Such festivals, now common in Thebes, enriched the life of the fast growing metropolis with a kaleidoscopic variety which may be compared only with similar periods in Rome under the emperors. The religious feasts of the seventh month were celebrated with such opulent splendour, that the month quickly gained the epithet, 'That of Amenhotep,' a designation still surviving among the natives of modern Egypt, who employ it without the faintest knowledge of the imperial ruler, their ancestor, whose name is perpetuated in it.

Amenhotep III was very fond of hunting, and when his scouts brought him word that a herd of wild cattle had appeared among the hills bordering the Delta, he would leave the palace at Memphis in the evening, sail north all night and reach the herd in the early morning. On one occasion there were no less than one hundred and seventy wild cattle in the enclosure, into which his beaters had driven them. Entering it in his chariot the king himself slew fifty-six of the savage beasts on the first day, to which number, after four days interval of rest, he added probably twenty more at a second onslaught. Amenhotep thought the achievement worthy of commemoration and issued a series of scarabs bearing a record of the feat. When the chase-loving king had completed ten years of lion-hunting he distributed to the nobles of the court a similar

memorial of his prowess, which, after the usual royal titulary of himself and his queen, bore the words: 'Statement of lions which his majesty brought down with his own arrows from the year one to the year ten: fierce lions, 102.' Some thirty or forty of these scarabs of the lion-hunt still survive.

It will be seen that in these things a new and modern tendency was maturing. The divine Pharaoh was constantly being exhibited in human relations, and the affairs of the royal house were made public property. This is nowhere clearer than in the emperor's marriage. While still crown prince, or at least early in his reign, he married a remarkable woman of low birth, named Tiy. The evidence usually cited to prove her of foreign birth is doubtful, and the remains of the bodies of her parents disclose them to be Egyptians. The criticisms of this marriage were met by the young Pharaoh with unflinching boldness. He issued a large number of scarabs, carved in stone and engraved with a record of the marriage, in which the untitled parentage of his queen frankly follows her name in the royal titulary itself, which declares her to be the queen-consort. But the record closes with the words: 'She is the wife of a mighty king whose southern boundary is as far as Karoy and northern as far as Naharin.' Recalling the vast extent of his sovereignty from the Sudan to the Upper Euphrates, the emperor thus bade any who might reflect upon the humble origin of the queen to remember the exalted station which she now occupied. From the beginning the new queen exerted a powerful influence over Amenhotep, and he immediately inserted her name in the official caption placed at the head of royal documents. Her power continued throughout his reign, and was the beginning of a remarkable era characterized by the prominence of the queens in state affairs and on public occasions, a peculiarity which we find only under Amenhotep III and his immediate successors. The name of the queen, therefore, not even a woman of royal birth, thus constantly appearing at the head of official documents side by side with that of the Pharaoh, was a frequent reminder of the more human and less exalted relations into which the sovereign had now entered. In constant intercourse with the nations of Asia he was likewise gradually forced from his old superhuman state, suited only to the Nile, into less provincial and more modern relations with his neighbours of Babylon and Mitanni, who in their letters called him 'brother.' This lion-hunting, bull-baiting Pharaoh, who had made a woman of lowly birth his queen, was far indeed from the godlike and unapproachable immobility of his divine ancestors. It was as if

the emperor of China or the Dalai Lama of Tibet were all at once to make his personal doings known on a series of medals. Whether consciously or not, the Pharaoh had assumed a modern standpoint, which must inevitably lead to sharp conflict with the almost irresistible inertia of tradition in an oriental country.

Meantime all went well; the lines of the coming internal struggle were not yet clearly drawn, and of the first signs of trouble from without Amenhotep was unconscious. A veritable 'Caesar divus' he presided over the magnificence of Thebes. In the thirtieth year of his reign he celebrated his first royal jubilee, and we have a record of his third jubilee in the year thirty-six. On this occasion the old monarch was still able to grant the court an audience and receive their congratulations. But ominous signs of trouble had by this time appeared on the northern horizon. Mitanni had been invaded by the Hittites, but Tushratta, the Mitannian king, had been able to repel them, and sent to Amenhotep a chariot and pair, besides two slaves, as a present from the booty which the Hittites had left in his hands. The provinces of Egypt in northern Syria had not been spared. The Hittites had invaded Katna in the Orontes valley, and carried off the image of Amon-Re, with the name of Amenhotep on it. Nukhashshi, which perhaps lay farther north, suffered a similar invasion. See pp. 262, 301.

All this was not without the connivance of treacherous vassals of the Pharaoh, who were themselves attempting the conquest of territory on their own account. The afterward notorious Aziru and his father, Abd-Ashirta, were leaders in the movement, entering Katna and Nukhashshi from the south and plundering as they went. Others who had made common cause with them threatened Ubi, the region of Damascus. Aki-izzi of Katna and Rib-Addi of Byblus quickly reported the defection of the Pharaoh's vassals. The situation was far more critical than it appeared to the Pharaoh, for he had no means of recognizing the seriousness of the Hittite advance. Amenhotep, therefore, instead of marching with his entire army immediately into north Syria, as Thutmose III would have done, sent troops only. These of course had no trouble in momentarily quelling the turbulent dynasts and putting a brief stop to their aggressions against the loyal vassals; but they were quite unable to cope with the southern advance of the Hittites, who secured a footing in northern Naharin, of the greatest value in their further plans for the conquest of Syria. Furthermore, the king's long absence from Syria was telling upon Egyptian prestige there, and another threatening danger to his Asiatic

possessions is stated to have begun from the day when the king had last left Sidon. An invasion of Habiru (Khabiru), perhaps desert Semites, such as had from time to time inundated Syria and Palestine from time immemorial, was now taking place. It was of such proportions that it may fairly be called an immigration. Before Amenhotep III's death it had become threatening, and thus Rib-Addi of Byblus later wrote to Amenhotep III's son: 'Since thy father returned from Sidon, since that time, the lands have fallen into the hands of the Habiru.' See further, p. 123.

Under such threatening conditions as these the old Pharaoh, whom we may well call 'Amenhotep the Magnificent,' drew near his end. His brother of Mitanni, with whom he was still on terms of intimacy, probably knowing of his age and weakness, sent the image of Ishtar of Nineveh for the second time to Egypt, doubtless in the hope that the far-famed goddess might be able to exorcise the evil spirits which were causing Amenhotep's infirmity and restore the old king to health. But all such means were of no avail, and about 1375 B.C., after nearly thirty-six years upon the throne, 'Amenhotep the Magnificent' passed away and was buried with the other emperors, his fathers, in the Valley of the Kings' Tombs.

CHAPTER VI

IKHNATON, THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTIONARY

I. IKHNATON'S RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT

AMENHOTEP IV, the young and inexperienced son of Amenhotep III and the queen Tiy, inherited a difficult situation. The conflict of new forces with tradition was, as we have seen, already felt by his father. The task before him was so to manipulate these conflicting forces as eventually to give reasonable play to the new and modern tendency, but at the same time to conserve enough of the old to prevent a catastrophe. It was a problem of practical statesmanship, but Amenhotep IV saw it chiefly in its ideal aspects. His mother, Tiy, and his queen, Nofretete, perhaps a woman of Asiatic birth, and a favourite priest, Eye, the husband of his nurse, formed his immediate circle. The first two probably exercised a powerful influence over him, and were given a prominent share in the government, at least as far as its public manifestations were concerned: for, in a manner quite surpassing his father's similar tendency, he constantly appeared in public with both his mother and his wife. The lofty though impracticable aims which he had in view must have found a ready response in these his two most influential counsellors. Thus, while Egypt was in sore need of a vigorous and skilled administrator, the young king was in close counsel with a priest and two perhaps gifted women, who, however able, were not of the fibre to show the new Pharaoh what the empire really demanded. Instead of gathering the army so sadly needed in Naharin, as Thutmose III would have done, Amenhotep IV immersed himself heart and soul in the thought of the time, and the philosophizing theology of the priests was of more importance to him than all the provinces of Asia. In such contemplations he gradually developed ideals and purposes which make him the most remarkable of all the Pharaohs, and, we may even say, the first *individual* in human history.

The profound influence of Egypt's imperial position had not been limited to the externals of life, to the manners and customs of the people, to the rich and prolific art, pregnant with new

possibilities of beauty, but had extended likewise to thought and religion. In the Old Kingdom the Sun-god was conceived as a Pharaoh, whose kingdom was Egypt. With the expansion of the Egyptian kingdom into a world-empire it was inevitable that the domain of the god should likewise expand. As the kingdom had long since found expression in religion, so now the empire was a powerful influence upon religious thought. This is evident in the remark of a great military leader like Thutmose III regarding his god (Amon): 'He seeth the whole earth hourly.' If this was true it was because the sword of the Pharaoh had carried the power of Egypt's god to the limits of Egypt's empire.

While this was a more or less mechanical and unconscious process, it was accompanied by an intellectual awakening which shook the old Egyptian traditions to the foundations and set the men of the age to thinking in a larger world. Of what stuff Thutmose III was made we have already seen (p. 87). The idea of universal power, of a world-empire, was visibly and tangibly bodied forth in his career. The first *human* personality of world-wide aspects was sure to affect men's ideas of *divine* personality. There is a touch of universalism now discernible in the theology of the empire: it is directly due to such impressions as Thutmose III and his successors made. Egypt was forced out of the immemorial isolation of her narrow valley into world-relations, with which the theology of the time must reckon—relations with which the Sun-god was inextricably involved. Commercial connections, maintained from an immemorially remote past, had resulted in the Middle Kingdom in a literature of adventure in far-off countries, as illustrated by such tales as the Shipwrecked Sailor or the Story of Sinuhe (vol. 1, p. 348), but such knowledge of distant lands had done little toward bringing the great world without into the purview of Egyptian religious thinking. The limits of the dominion of the Egyptian gods had been fixed as the outer fringes of the Nile valley long before the outside world was familiar to the Nile-dwellers; and merely commercial intercourse with a larger world had not been able to shake the tradition. Many a merchant had seen a stone fall in distant Babylon and in Thebes alike, but it had not occurred to him, or to any man in that far-off age, that the same natural force reigned in these widely separated countries. Many a merchant of that day, too, had seen the sun rise behind the Babylonian ziggurats, as it did among the clustered obelisks of Thebes; but the thought of the age had not yet come to terms with such far-reaching facts as these. It was universalism expressed in terms of *imperial power* which first caught the imagination of the thinking men of the empire, and disclosed to them the

universal sweep of the Sun-god's dominion as a physical fact. In the Ancient East monotheism was but imperialism in religion. Already under Amenhotep III an old name for the material sun, 'Aton,' had come into prominent use, where the name of the Sun-god might have been expected. Thus, he called the royal barge on which he sailed with Tiy on her beautiful lake, 'Aton gleams,' and a company of his body-guard bore the new god's name. He appended to his own name the epithet, 'dawning like Aton,' or even called himself 'the shining Aton.' A cult of the newly named Sun-god had really been inaugurated and there was probably a chapel dedicated to him at Heliopolis. Now and again he had even been designated as 'the sole god' by Amenhotep III's contemporaries.

Amenhotep IV was soon closely associated with the new ideas. Like some other rulers of his line, he had been crowned in Hermonthis, known as the 'Upper Egyptian Heliopolis,' where the Solar theology was strong, and a brother of his mother was high-priest there. Early in his reign we find him there engaged in the worship of Aton, in a temple of the god, of which he may have been the builder. He made no attempt to conceal the identity of the new deity with the old Sun-god, Re. He assumed the office of high-priest of Aton with the same title, 'Great Seer,' as that of the high-priest of Re at Heliopolis. But, however evident the Heliopolitan origin of the new state-religion might be, it was not merely Sun-worship; the word Aton was employed in place of the old word for 'god' (*neter*), and the god was evidently conceived to be far more than the merely material sun. The king was evidently deifying the light or the vital heat which he found accompanying all life. It plays an important part similar to that which we find it assuming in the early cosmogonic philosophies of the Greeks. Thence, as we might expect, the god is stated to be everywhere active by means of his 'rays.' In his age of the world it is perfectly certain that the king could not have had the vaguest notion of the physico-chemical aspects of his assumption, any more than had the early Greeks in dealing with a similar thought; yet the fundamental idea is surprisingly true, and, as we shall see, marvellously fruitful.

The most ancient symbol of the Sun-god was a pyramid, and, as a falcon, the figure of that bird was also used to designate him. These, however, were intelligible only in Egypt, and Amenhotep IV had a wider arena in view. *The new symbol depicted the sun as a disk from which diverging beams radiated downward, each ray terminating in a human hand. It was a masterly symbol, suggesting a power issuing from its celestial source, and putting its hand upon the*

world and the affairs of men. As far back as the Pyramid Texts the rays of the Sun-god had been likened to his arms and had been conceived as an agency on earth. The outward symbol of his god thus broke sharply with tradition; but it was capable of practical introduction in the many different countries making up the empire, and could be understood at a glance by any intelligent foreigner, which was far from the case with any of the traditional symbols of Egyptian religion. To indicate the imperial power of Aton, Amenhotep IV now enclosed the god's full name, as already introduced by his father, in two royal cartouches, suggesting for the god an earthly dominion like that of the Pharaoh.

His zeal for the new cult was evident from the beginning. He sent an expedition to the sandstone quarries of Silsileh to secure the great shaft for an obelisk to be erected in Amenhotep III's Karnak temple of Aton, and the chief nobles of his court were in charge of the works at the quarry. Thebes was now called 'City of the Brightness of Aton,' and the temple-quarter, 'Brightness of Aton the Great'; while the Aton sanctuary itself bore the name of 'Gem-Aton,' a term of uncertain meaning. Although the other gods were still tolerated as of old, it was nevertheless inevitable that the priesthood of Amon should view with growing jealousy the brilliant rise of a strange god in their midst, an artificial creation of which they knew nothing, save that much of the wealth formerly employed in the enrichment of Amon's sanctuary was now lavished on the intruder. The priesthood of Amon was now a rich and influential body, and the high-priest of Amon was also the supreme head of the organization including all the priests of the nation, besides sometimes holding the chief treasurership of the empire, or even the office of grand vizier. The Amonite priesthood had installed Thutmose III as king; and could they have supplanted with one of their own tools the young dreamer who now held the throne, they would of course have done so at the first opportunity. But Amenhotep IV possessed unlimited personal force of character, and he was moreover the son of a line of rulers too strong and too illustrious to be thus set aside, even by the most powerful priesthood in the land. A bitter conflict ensued, in which the issue was sharply drawn between Aton and the old gods. It rendered Thebes intolerable to the young king. He decided to break with the priesthoods and to make Aton the sole god, not merely in his own thought, but in very fact. As far as their external and material manifestations and equipment were concerned, the annihilation of the old gods could be and was accomplished without delay. The priesthoods,

including that of Amon, were dispossessed, the official temple-worship of the various gods throughout the land ceased, and their names were erased wherever they could be found upon the monuments.

The persecution of Amon was especially severe. The cemetery of Thebes was visited and in the tombs of the ancestors the hated name of Amon was hammered out wherever it appeared upon the stone. The rows on rows of statues of the great nobles of the old and glorious days of the empire, ranged along the walls of the Karnak temple, were not spared, and the god's name was invariably erased. Stone-cutters climbed to the tops of Hatshepsut's lofty obelisks and cut out the name of Amon to the very apex. The royal statues of his ancestors, including even the king's father, were not respected; and, what was worse, as the name of that father, Amenhotep, contained the name of Amon, the young king was placed in the unpleasant predicament of being obliged to cut out his own father's name in order to prevent the name of Amon from appearing 'writ large' on all the temples of Thebes. Even the private living apartments of Amenhotep III in his splendid Theban palace at modern Medinet Habu were invaded, and the king's name erased in the sumptuous wall decorations. Frequently the word 'gods' was not permitted to remain on the old monuments; and the walls of the temples at Thebes were painfully searched in order that the compromising word might be blotted out (see p. 206). And then there was the embarrassment of the king's own name, likewise Amenhotep, meaning 'Amon rests' or 'is satisfied,' which could not be spoken or placed on a monument. It was of necessity also banished and the king assumed in its place the name 'Ikhnaton,' which means 'Aton is satisfied,' or 'He in whom Aton is satisfied.'

This terrible revolution, violating all that was dearest and most sacred in Egyptian life, must have been a devastating experience for the youthful king, perhaps not yet nineteen at this time¹. Thebes

¹ In view of the supposed youth of this extraordinary king, attention has very appropriately been called to the remarkable career of El-Hākim ibn-'Azīz (A.D. 996-1021), who began to rule at Cairo as a lad of eleven. He exerted a great influence in religious conflicts between Shiites and Sunnites and issued extraordinary heretical decrees when only sixteen years of age (Möller, *Z. Aeg.*, LVI (1920), p. 100 sq.). On the other hand, Sethe has offered very cogent reasons for rejecting the identification of the alleged body of Ikhnaton found in his coffin as certainly that of our heretical Pharaoh ('Beiträge zur Geschichte Amenophis IV,' *Nachrichten der Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1921, Heft 2, pp. 122-130). Sethe believes the king was at least 25 to 26 years old at his accession.

had become an impossible place of residence. In his father's palace, which he doubtless occupied, he found unsightly gaps in the lovely wall decorations where once his father's cartouche had stood. As he looked across the city he saw stretching along the western plain that imposing line of mortuary temples of his fathers which he had violated. They now stood silent and empty. The towering pylons and obelisks of Karnak and Luxor were not a welcome reminder of all that his fathers had contributed to the glory of Amon, and the unfinished hall of his father at Luxor, with the superb columns of the nave, still waiting for the roof, could hardly have stirred pleasant memories in the heart of the young reformer. A doubtless long contemplated plan was therefore undertaken. Aton, the god of the empire, should possess his own city in each of the three great divisions of the empire: Egypt, Asia and Nubia, and the god's Egyptian city should be made the royal residence. It must have been an enterprise requiring some time, but the three cities were duly founded. The Aton-city of Nubia was located on the east side of the river somewhere in the vicinity of the third cataract, and was thus in the heart of the Egyptian province. It was named 'Gem-Aton' after the Aton-temple in Thebes. In Syria the Aton-city is unknown, but Ikhnaton will not have done less for Aton there than his fathers had done for Amon¹.

In the sixth year of his reign, and shortly after he had changed his name, the king was living in his own Aton-city in Egypt. He chose as its site a fine and spacious bay in the cliffs about one hundred and sixty miles above the Delta and nearly three hundred miles below Thebes. He called it Akhetaton, 'Horizon of Aton'—it is known in modern times as Tell el-Amarna. In addition to the town, which was about a mile wide and some four miles long, the territory around it was demarked as a domain belonging to the god, and included the plain on both sides of the river. In the cliffs on either side, fourteen large *stelae*, one of them no less than twenty-six feet in height, were cut into the rock, bearing inscriptions determining the limits of the entire sacred district around the city. As thus laid out the district was about eight

¹ The Aton-city in Syria may have been in existence under Amenhotep III. The effort of Borchardt (*M.D.O.G.*, No. 57, March, 1917) to prove that Akhetaton (Amarna) had been founded as far back as Thutmose IV, and to shift the origins and the essentials of the Aton movement to the predecessors of Amenhotep IV, thus depriving him of all historical significance, has been completely refuted by Schaefer (*Z. Aeg.*, LV, 1918, pp. 1-43). See also below, p. 205.

miles wide from north to south, and from twelve to over seventeen miles long from cliff to cliff. The region thus demarked was then legally conveyed to Aton by the king's own decree, saying: 'Now as for the area within the...landmarks from the eastern mountain (cliffs) to the western mountain of Akhetaton opposite, it belongs to my father, Aton, who is given life forever and ever: whether mountains or cliffs, or swamps...or uplands, or fields, or waters, or towns, or shores, or people, or cattle, or trees, or anything which Aton, my father, has made....I have conveyed it to Aton, my father, forever and ever.'

The city thus established was to be the real capital of the empire, for the king himself said: 'The whole land shall come hither, for the beautiful seat of Akhetaton shall be another seat (capital), and I will give them audience whether they be north or south or west or east.' The royal architect, Bek, was sent to the first cataract to procure stone for the new temple, or we should rather say temples, for no less than three were now built in the new city, one for the queen-mother, Tiy, and another for the princess Beketaton ('Maid-servant of Aton'), besides the state-temple of the king himself. Around the temples rose the palace of the king and the châteaux of his nobles, one of whom describes the city thus: 'Akhetaton, great in loveliness, mistress of pleasant ceremonies, rich in possessions, the offerings of Re in her midst. At the sight of her beauty there is rejoicing. She is lovely and beautiful; when one sees her it is like a glimpse of heaven. Her number cannot be calculated. When the Aton rises in her he fills her with his rays, and he embraces (with his rays) his beloved son, son of eternity, who came forth from Aton and offers the earth to him who placed him on his throne, causing the earth to belong to him who made him.'

It becomes more and more evident that all that was devised and done in the new city and in the propagation of the Aton faith bears the stamp of Ikhnaton's individuality. A king who did not hesitate to erase his own father's name on the monuments in order to destroy Amon, the great foe of his revolutionary movement, was not one to stop halfway; and the men about him, in spite of his youth, must have been irresistibly swayed by the young Pharaoh's unbending will. But Ikhnaton understood enough of the old policy of the Pharaohs to know that he must hold his party by practical rewards, and the leading partisans of his movement, like Merire, enjoyed liberal bounty at his hands. Thus one of his priests of Aton, and at the same time his master of the royal horse, named Eye, who had by good fortune happened

to marry the nurse of the king, renders this very evident in such statements as the following: 'He doubles to me my favours in silver and gold'; or again, addressing the king, 'How prosperous is he who hears thy teaching of life! He is satisfied with seeing thee without ceasing.' The general of the army, Mai, enjoyed similar bounty, boasting of it in the same way: 'He hath doubled to me my favours like the numbers of the sand. I am the head of the officials, at the head of the people; my lord has advanced me because I have carried out his teaching, and I hear his word without ceasing. My eyes behold thy beauty every day, O my lord, wise like Aton, satisfied with truth. How prosperous is he who hears thy teaching of life!' Although there must have been a nucleus of men who really appreciated the ideal aspects of the king's teaching, it is thus evident that many were not uninfluenced by 'the loaves and the fishes.'

Among such royal favours there was one which no Egyptian noble could fail to welcome. This was the beautiful cliff-tomb which the king commanded his craftsmen to hew out of the eastern cliffs for each one of his favourites. The old mortuary practices were not all suppressed by Ikhnaton, and it was still necessary for a man to be buried in the 'eternal house,' with its endowment for the support of the deceased in the hereafter. But that eternal house was no longer disfigured with hideous demons and grotesque monsters which should confront the dead in the future life; and the magic paraphernalia necessary to meet and vanquish the dark powers of the nether world, which filled the tombs of the old order at Thebes, were completely banished. The tomb now became a monument to the deceased; the walls of its chapel bore fresh and natural pictures from the life of the people in Akhetaton, particularly the incidents in the official career of the dead man, and preferably his intercourse with the king. Thus the city of Akhetaton is now better known to us from its cemetery than from its ruins.

Throughout these tombs the nobles take delight in reiterating, both in relief and inscription, the intimate relation between Aton and the king. Over and over again they show the king and the queen standing together under the disk of Amon, whose rays, terminating in hands, descend and embrace the king. The vulture-goddess, Mut, who, since the hoary age of the Thinites had appeared on all the monuments extending her protecting wings over the Pharaoh's head, had long since been banished. The nobles constantly pray to the god for the king, saying that he 'came forth from thy rays,' or 'thou hast formed him out of thine

own rays'; and interspersed through their prayers were numerous current phrases of the Aton faith, which had now become conventional, replacing those of the old orthodox religion, which it must have been very awkward for them to cease using. Thus they demonstrated how zealous they had been in accepting and appropriating the king's new teaching. On state occasions, instead of the old stock phrases, with innumerable references to the traditional gods, every noble who would enjoy the king's favour was evidently obliged to show his familiarity with the Aton faith and the king's position in it by a liberal use of these allusions. The source of such phrases was really the king himself, as we have before intimated, and something of the 'teaching' whence they were taken, so often attributed to him, is preserved in the tombs to which we have referred.

Of all the monuments left by this unparalleled revolution, the Aton hymns are by far the most remarkable; and from them we may gather an intimation of Ikhnaton's beliefs. Two hymns to Aton, both of which the nobles had engraved on the walls of their tomb chapels, were probably written by the king; and the longer and finer of the two is worthy of being known in modern literature. The titles of the separate strophes are the addition of the present writer, and in the translation no attempt has been made to do more than to furnish an accurate rendering. It will be observed that Psalm civ shows a notable similarity to our hymn both in the thought and the sequence (see *vv.* 20-23, 16-18, 25-27, 24, 19, 2, 5).

NIGHT

When thou settest in the western horizon of the sky,
The earth is in darkness like the dead;
They sleep in their chambers,
Their heads are wrapped up,
Their nostrils are stopped,
And none seeth the other,
While all their things are stolen,
Which are under their heads,
And they know it not.
Every lion cometh forth from his den,
All serpents, they sting.
Darkness. . . .
The world is in silence,
He that made them resteth in his horizon.

DAY AND MAN

Bright is the earth when thou risest in the horizon.
 When thou shinest as Aton by day
 Thou drivest away the darkness.
 When thou sendest forth thy rays,
 The Two Lands (Egypt) are in daily festivity,
 Awake and standing upon their feet
 When thou hast raised them up.
 Their limbs bathed, they take their clothing,
 Their arms uplifted in adoration to thy dawning
 (Then) in all the world they do their work.

DAY AND THE ANIMALS AND PLANTS

All cattle rest upon their pasturage,
 The trees and the plants flourish,
 The birds flutter in their marshes,
 Their wings uplifted in adoration to thee.
 All the sheep dance upon their feet,
 All winged things fly,
 They live when thou hast shone upon them.

DAY AND THE WATERS

The barques sail up-stream and down-stream alike.
 Every highway is open because thou dawnest.
 The fish in the river leap up before thee.
 Thy rays are in the midst of the great green sea.

CREATION OF MAN

Creator of the germ in woman,
 Maker of seed in man,
 Giving life to the son in the body of his mother,
 Soothing him that he may not weep,
 Nurse (even) in the womb,
 Giver of breath to animate every one that he maketh!
 When he cometh forth from the womb...on the day of his birth,
 Thou openest his mouth in speech,
 Thou suppliest his necessities.

CREATION OF ANIMALS

When the fledgling in the egg chirps in the shell,
 Thou givest him breath therein to preserve him alive.
 When thou hast brought him together (?)
 To (the point of) bursting it in the egg,
 He cometh forth from the egg
 To chirp with all his might (?).
 He goeth about upon his two feet
 When he hath come forth therefrom.

THE WHOLE CREATION

How manifold are thy works!
They are hidden from before (us),
O sole God, whose powers no other possesseth.
Thou didst create the earth according to thy heart
While thou wast alone:
Men, all cattle, large and small,
All that are upon the earth,
That go about upon their feet;
(All) that are on high,
That fly with their wings.
The foreign countries, Syria and Kush,
The land of Egypt,
Thou settest every man into his place,
Thou suppliest their necessities.
Every one has his possessions,
And his days are reckoned.
The tongues are divers in speech,
Their forms likewise and their skins are distinguished.
(For) thou makest different the strangers.

This royal hymn, of which the above lines are a part, doubtless represents an excerpt, or a series of fragments excerpted, from the ritual of Aton, as it was celebrated from day to day in the Aton temple at Amarna. Unhappily, it was copied in the cemetery in but one tomb. The other tombs were likewise supplied with their devotional inscriptions, from the current paragraphs and stock phrases which made up the knowledge of the new faith as understood by the scribes and painters who decorated these tombs. It should not be forgotten, therefore, that the fragments of the Aton faith which have survived to us in the Amarna cemetery, our chief source, have thus filtered mechanically through the indifferent hands and the starved and listless minds of a few petty bureaucrats on the outskirts of a great religious and intellectual movement. Nevertheless in this great hymn the universalism of the empire finds full expression and the royal singer sweeps his eye from the far-off cataracts of the Nubian Nile to the remotest lands of Syria. It is clear that he is projecting a world-religion and endeavouring to displace by it the nationalism which had preceded it for twenty centuries. He bases the universal sway of God upon his fatherly care of all men alike, irrespective of race or nationality, and he calls Aton 'the father and the mother of all that he had made.' To the proud and exclusive Egyptian he points to the all-embracing bounty of the common father of humanity, even placing Syria and Nubia before Egypt in his enumeration.

Ikhнатон thus grasped the idea of a world-lord, as the creator of nature; but the king likewise saw revealed the creator's beneficent purpose for all his creatures, even the meanest. He discerned in some measure the goodness of the All-Father as did He who bade us consider the lilies. The picture of the lily-grown marshes, where the flowers are 'drunken' in the intoxicating radiance of Aton, where the birds unfold their wings and lift them 'in adoration of the living Aton,' where the cattle dance with delight in the sunshine, and the fish in the river beyond leap up to greet the light, the universal light whose beams are even 'in the midst of the great green sea'—all this discloses a discernment of the presence of God in nature, and an appreciation of the revelation of God in the visible world such as we find centuries later in the Hebrew psalms, and in our own poets of nature since Wordsworth.

While Ikhнатон recognized clearly the power, and especially the beneficence of God, it may be due to the accidents of preservation that our surviving sources for the Aton faith do not disclose a very spiritual conception of the deity nor any attribution to him of ethical qualities beyond those which Re had long been supposed to possess. Our sources do not show us that the king had perceptibly risen from a discernment of the beneficence to a conception of the righteousness in the character of God, nor for His demand for this in the character of men. Nevertheless, there is in Ikhнатон's 'teaching,' as it is fragmentarily preserved in the hymns and tomb-inscriptions of his nobles, a constant emphasis upon 'truth' such as is not found before or since. The king always attaches to his name the phrase 'living in truth,' and that this phrase was not meaningless is evident in his daily life (cf. p. 399). To him it meant acceptance of the daily facts of living in a simple and unconventional manner. For him what *was* was right, and its propriety was evident by its very existence. Thus, his family life was open and unconcealed before the people. He took the greatest delight in his children, and appeared with them and the queen, their mother, on all possible occasions, as if he had been but the humblest scribe in the Aton-temple. He had himself depicted on the monuments while enjoying the most familiar and unaffected intercourse with his family, and whenever he appeared in the temple to offer sacrifice the queen and the daughters she had borne him participated in the service. All that was natural was to him true, and he never failed practically to exemplify this belief, however radically he was obliged to disregard tradition. See p. 411 sq.

The art of the age was unavoidably affected by this extraordinary revolution, and the king's interest in the new art is evident. Bek, his chief sculptor, appended to his title the words, 'whom his majesty himself taught.' Thus, the artists of his court were taught to make the chisel and the brush tell the story of what they actually saw. The result was a simple and beautiful realism that saw more clearly than any art had ever seen before. They caught the instantaneous postures of animal life: the coursing hound, the fleeing game, the wild bull leaping in the swamp; for all these belonged to the 'truth,' in which Ikhnaton lived. The king's person, as we have indicated, was no exception to the law of the new art; the artists represented Ikhnaton as they *saw* him. The monuments of Egypt bore what they had never borne before, a Pharaoh depicted in the natural and unaffected relations of life, not frozen in the conventional posture demanded by the traditions of court propriety.

This unparalleled revolution in art has now been unexpectedly revealed to us in all its wondrous beauty and freedom by the extraordinary works of the artist-craftsman preserved in the tomb of Tutenkhamon. Of the finest pieces found among this sumptuous furniture of Ikhnaton's son-in-law several were made at Amarna, and were carried back thence by Tutenkhamon to Thebes on his return thither. See further, pp. 415 *sqq.*

II. THE FOREIGN SITUATION AND THE FALL OF IKHNATON

Wholly absorbed in the exalted religion to which he had given his life, stemming the tide of tradition that was daily as strong against him as at first, this young revolutionary of twenty-five was beset with too many enterprises and responsibilities of a totally different nature, to give much attention to the affairs of the empire abroad. Indeed, as we shall see, he probably did not realize the necessity of doing so until it was far too late. On his accession his sovereignty in Asia had immediately been recognized by the Hittites and the powers of the Euphrates valley. Tushratta of Mitanni wrote to the queen-mother, Tiy, requesting her influence with the new king for a continuance of the old friendship which he had enjoyed with Ikhnaton's father, and to the young king he wrote a letter of condolence on the death of his father, Amenhotep III, not forgetting to add the usual requests for plentiful gold. Burraburiash of Babylon sent similar assurances of sympathy, and a son of his later sojourned at Ikhnaton's court and

married a daughter of the latter, and her Babylonian father-in-law sent her a noble necklace of over a thousand gems. But such intercourse did not last.

The advance of the Hittites across the Syrian frontiers of the Egyptian empire, already threatening in Amenhotep III's time, had now created a serious situation in Asia. The leading group of these remarkable peoples of Asia Minor, who still form one of the greatest problems in the study of the early Orient, had now coalesced into a powerful empire with which the Egyptians had first come into contact under Thutmose III, who called the new power 'Great Kheta,' as perhaps distinguished from the less important independent Hittite peoples (see chap. xi). We shall use the word Hittite to designate this empire of Great Kheta. When Ikhnaton ascended the throne, Seplel (cuneiform, Shubbiluliuma), the king of the Hittites, wrote him a letter of congratulation, and to all appearances had only the friendliest intentions toward Egypt. For the first invasions of the most advanced Hittites, like that which Tushratta of Mitanni repulsed, he may indeed not have been responsible. Even after Ikhnaton's removal to Akhetaton, his new capital, some Hittite embassy appeared there with gifts and greetings; and the tomb of Merire provides us with the first Egyptian representation of Hittites. But Ikhnaton must have regarded the old relations as no longer desirable, for the Hittite king asks him why he has ceased the correspondence which his father had maintained. If he realized the situation, the Pharaoh had good reason indeed for abandoning the connection; for the Hittite empire now stood on the northern threshold of Syria, the greatest power in Asia, and the most formidable enemy which had ever confronted Egypt.

At this juncture Egypt lost her staunchest friend and supporter on the upper Euphrates, the kingdom of Mitanni, whose rulers had been close relatives of the Egyptian sovereigns since the reign of Ikhnaton's grandfather. Tushratta, the reigning king of Mitanni, was suddenly slain by one of his own sons, and a ruinous civil war followed. Taking advantage of Mitanni's internal weakness, Shubbiluliuma, who had long been fighting with Tushratta, gave his daughter in marriage to Tushratta's son Mattiuaza, and then forced Mitanni to accept his new son-in-law as king. Mitanni, Egypt's northern ally, was thus suddenly shifted to the Hittite side in the international struggle in western Asia. Among the Pharaoh's Asiatic vassals, likewise, the situation had meantime gone from bad to worse. Immediately on Ikhnaton's accession the disaffected dynasts, who had been temporarily suppressed by

his father, resumed their operations against the faithful vassals of Egypt. The exact sequence of events is not clear. With the co-operation of the unfaithful Egyptian vassals Abd-Ashirta and his son Aziru, who were at the head of an Amorite kingdom on the upper Orontes, together with Itakama, a Syrian prince who had been conquered by the Hittites and who had seized Kadesh as his kingdom, the Hittites took possession of Amki, the plain on the north side of the lower Orontes, between Antioch and the Amanus. Three faithful vassal kings of the vicinity marched to recover the Pharaoh's lost territory for him, but were met by Itakama at the head of Hittite troops and driven back. All three wrote immediately to the Pharaoh of the trouble and complained of Itakama. Aziru of Amor had meantime advanced upon the Phoenician and north Syrian coast cities, which he captured as far as Ugarit at the mouth of the Orontes, slaying their kings and appropriating their wealth. Simyra and Byblus held out, however, and, as the Hittites advanced into Nukhashshi, on the lower Orontes, Aziru co-operated with them and captured Niy, whose king he slew. Tunip was now in such grave danger that her elders wrote the Pharaoh a pathetic letter beseeching his protection (pp. 83, 308).

Meanwhile, Rib-Addi, a faithful vassal of Byblus, where there was an Egyptian temple, writes to the Pharaoh the most urgent appeals, stating what is going on, and asking for help to drive away Aziru's people from Simyra, knowing full well that, if it falls, his own city of Byblus is likewise doomed. But no help comes. Several Egyptian deputies have been charged with the investigation of affairs at Simyra, but they did not succeed in doing anything, and the city finally fell. Aziru had no hesitation in slaying the Egyptian deputy resident in the place, and having destroyed it, was now free to move against Byblus. Rib-Addi wrote in horror of these facts to the Pharaoh, stating that the Egyptian deputy, resident in Kumidi in northern Palestine, was now in danger. But the wily Aziru so used his friends at court that he escaped. With Machiavellian skill and cynicism, he explains in letters to the Pharaoh that he is unable to come and give an account of himself at the Egyptian court, as he had been commanded to do, because the Hittites are in Nukhashshi, and he fears that Tunip will not be strong enough to resist them! Fortunately the letter from the elders of Tunip shows what they thought about his presence in Nukhashshi. To the Pharaoh's demand that he immediately rebuild Simyra, which he had destroyed (as he claimed, to prevent it from falling into the hands

of the Hittites), he replies that he is too hard pressed in defending the king's cities in Nukhashshi against the Hittites; but that he will do so within a year. Ikhnaton is reassured by Aziru's promises to pay the same tribute as that paid by the cities which he has taken. Such acknowledgment of Egyptian suzerainty by the turbulent dynasts everywhere must have left in the Pharaoh a feeling of security which the situation by no means justified. He therefore wrote Aziru granting him the year which he had asked for before he appeared at court, but Aziru contrived to evade Khani, the Egyptian bearer of the king's letter, which was thus brought back to Egypt without being delivered. It shows the astonishing leniency of Ikhnaton in a manner which would indicate that he was opposed to measures of force such as his fathers had employed. Aziru immediately wrote to the king expressing his regret that an expedition against the Hittites in the north had deprived him of the pleasure of meeting the Pharaoh's envoy, in spite of the fact that he had made all haste homeward as soon as he had heard of his coming (p. 307 *sq.*). The claims of the hostile dynasts were so skilfully made that the resident Egyptian deputies actually did not seem to know who were the faithful vassals and who the secretly rebellious. In particular, a large collection of letters from Rib-Addi to Egypt throw astonishing light upon the network of intrigue and the difficulty of distinguishing friend from foe. See pp. 303 *sqq.*

In the south, where the movement of the Habiru (Aramaeans Semites?) may be compared with that of the Hittites in the north, similar conditions evidently prevailed. Knots of their warriors were now appearing everywhere and taking service as mercenary troops under the dynasts. Under various adventurers the Habiru were frequently the real masters, and Palestinian cities like Megiddo, Askalon and Gezer wrote to the Pharaoh for succour against them. The last-named city, together with Askalon and Lachish, united against Abdi-Khiba, the pro-Egyptian dynast in Jerusalem, already at this time an important stronghold of southern Palestine; and the faithful officer sent urgent dispatches to Ikhnaton explaining the danger and appealing for aid against the Habiru and their leaders. Abdi-Khiba was well acquainted with Ikhnaton's cuneiform scribe, and he adds to several of his dispatches a postscript addressed to his friend in which the urgent sincerity of the man is evident: 'To the scribe of my lord, the king, Abdi-Khiba thy servant. Bring these words plainly before my lord the king: "The whole land of my lord, the king, is going to ruin".' See p. 317.

Fleeing in terror before the Habiru, who burned the towns and laid waste the fields, many of the Palestinians forsook their towns and took to the hills, or sought refuge in Egypt, where (as we learn from Egyptian sources) the Egyptian officer in charge of some of them said of them: 'They have been destroyed and their town laid waste, and fire has been thrown (into their grain?).... Their countries are starving, they live like goats of the mountain. ...A few of the Asiatics, who knew not how they should live, have come (begging a home in the domain?) of Pharaoh, after the manner of your father's fathers since the beginning.... Now the Pharaoh gives them into your hand to protect their borders.' The task of those to whom the last words are addressed was hopeless. Both in Syria and Palestine the provinces of the Pharaoh had gradually passed entirely out of Egyptian control, and in the south a state of complete anarchy had resulted, in which the hopeless Egyptian party at last gave up any attempt to maintain the authority of the Pharaoh, and those who had not perished joined the enemy. The caravans of Buraburiash of Babylonia were plundered by the king of Accho and a neighbouring confederate, and Buraburiash wrote peremptorily demanding that the loss be made good and the guilty punished, lest his trade with Egypt become a constant prey of such marauding dynasts. But what he feared had come to pass, and the Egyptian empire in Asia was for the time at an end.

At Akhetaton, the new and beautiful capital, the splendid temple of Aton resounded with hymns to the new god of the empire, while the empire itself was no more. The tribute of Ikhnaton's twelfth year was received at Akhetaton as usual, and the king, borne in his gorgeous palanquin on the shoulders of eighteen soldiers, went forth to receive it in state. The habit of generations, and a fast vanishing apprehension lest the Pharaoh might appear in Syria with his army, still prompted a few sporadic letters from the dynasts, assuring him of their loyalty, which perhaps continued in the mind of Ikhnaton the illusion that he was still lord of Asia. The storm which had broken over his Asiatic empire was not more disastrous than that which threatened the fortunes of his house in Egypt. But he was steadfast as before in the propagation of his new faith. At his command temples of Aton had now arisen all over the land. He devoted himself to the elaboration of the temple ritual and the tendency to theologize somewhat dimmed the earlier freshness of the hymns to the god.

Meanwhile, the national convulsion which his revolution had

precipitated was producing the most disastrous consequences throughout the land. The Aton faith disregarded some of the most cherished beliefs of the people, especially those regarding the hereafter. Osiris, their old time protector and friend in the world of darkness, was banished from the tomb, and the magical paraphernalia which was to protect them from a thousand foes was gone. Some of them tried to put Aton into their old usages; but he was not a folk-god who lived out in yonder tree or spring, and he was too far from their homely round of daily needs to touch their lives. The people could understand nothing of the refinements involved in the new faith. They only knew that the worship of the old gods had been interdicted, and a strange deity of whom they had no knowledge and could gain none was forced upon them. Such a decree of the state could have had no more effect upon their practical worship in the end than did that of Theodosius when he banished the old gods of Egypt in favour of Christianity, eighteen hundred years after Ikhnaton's revolution. Long after the death of Theodosius the old so-called pagan gods continued to be worshipped by the people in Upper Egypt; for in the course of such attempted changes in the customs and traditional faith of a whole people, the span of one man's life is insignificant indeed. The Aton-faith remained but the cherished theory of the idealist, Ikhnaton, and a little court-circle; it never really became the religion of the people (see p. 207).

Added to the secret resentment and opposition of the people, we must consider also far more dangerous forces. During all of Ikhnaton's reign a powerful priestly party, openly or secretly, did all in its power to undermine him. Among the army and its leaders, the neglect and loss of the Asiatic empire must have turned against the king many a strong man, and aroused indignation among those whose grandfathers had served under Thutmose III. The memory of what had been done in those glorious days must have been sufficiently strong to fire the hearts of the military class and set them looking for a leader who would recover what had been lost. Ikhnaton might appoint one of his favourites to the command of the army, but his ideal aims and his high motives for peace would be as unpopular as they were unintelligible to his commanders. One such man, an officer named Harmhab, had now been long in the service of Ikhnaton and enjoying the royal favour; he contrived not only to win the support of the military class, but he also gained the favour of the priests of Amon, who were of course looking for some one who could bring them the opportunity they coveted. Thus, both the people and the priestly

and military classes alike were fomenting plans to overthrow the hated dreamer in the palace of the Pharaohs, of whose thoughts they understood so little.

To increase Ikhnaton's danger, fortune had decreed him no son, and he was obliged to depend for support, as the years passed, upon his son-in-law, a noble named Sakere, who had married his eldest daughter, Meritaton, 'Beloved of Aton.' Ikhnaton had probably never been physically strong; his spare face, with the lines of an ascetic, shows increasing traces of the cares which weighed so heavily upon him. He finally nominated Sakere as his successor and appointed him at the same time co-regent. He survived but a short time after this, and about 1358 B.C., having reached his seventeenth regnal year, he succumbed to the overwhelming forces that were against him. In a lonely valley some miles to the east of his city he was buried in a tomb which he had excavated in the rock for himself and family, and where his second daughter, Meketaton, already rested. His coffin was eventually carried by his friends to Thebes, where it was found by modern excavation in the tomb of his mother, Queen Tiy. Elliot Smith's examination of the skeleton, for such the body found in his coffin now is, has shown it to be that of a man less than thirty years of age at his death¹. And he had reigned at least sixteen years!

Thus disappeared the most remarkable figure in earlier oriental history. The sumptuous inscriptions on his beautiful coffin, now in the Museum at Cairo, call him 'the living Aton's beautiful child who lives forever, and is true (or just, or righteous) in sky and earth.' To his own nation he was afterwards known as 'the criminal of Akhetaton'; but however much we may censure him for the loss of the empire, which he allowed to slip from his fingers, however much we may condemn the fanaticism with which he pursued his aim, even to the violation of his own father's name and monuments, there died with him such a spirit as the world had never seen before—a brave soul, undauntedly facing the momentum of immemorial tradition, and thereby stepping out from the long line of conventional and colourless Pharaohs, that he might disseminate ideas far beyond and above the capacity of his age to understand. Among the Hebrews, seven or eight hundred years later, we look for such men; but the modern world has yet adequately to value or even acquaint itself with this man, who, in an age so remote and under conditions so adverse, became not only the world's first idealist and the world's first *individual*, but also the earliest monotheist, and the first prophet of inter-

¹ The identification has, however, been denied by Sethe, see p. 113, n.

nationalism—the most remarkable figure of the Ancient World before the Hebrews.

Ikhнатон's followers had prayed that his teaching might endure 'till the swan be black and the raven white, till the mountains rise up and move away, and water flows uphill'—and who shall say that it has not survived in modern belief? But the young king's death left it politically helpless. Sakere was quite unequal to the task before him, and after an obscure and ephemeral reign at Akhetaton he disappeared, to be followed by Tutenkhaton ('Living-Image-of-Aton'), another son-in-law of Ikhнатон, who had married the king's third daughter, Enkhosnepaaton ('She-lives-by-the-Aton'). Compelled to compromise, he forsook his father-in-law's city and transferred the court to Thebes, which had not seen a Pharaoh for twenty years. For a time Akhetaton maintained a precarious existence, and the manufacturies of coloured glass and faience which had flourished there during the reign of Ikhнатон soon languished. Then the place was gradually forsaken, until not a soul was left in its solitary streets. The roofs of the houses fell in, the walls tottered and collapsed, the temples fell a prey to the vengeance of the Theban party, and the once beautiful city of Aton was gradually transformed into a desolate ruin. Known to-day as Tell el-Amarna, it still stands as time and the priests of Amon left it. One may walk its ancient streets, where the walls of the houses are still several feet high, and strive to recall to its forsaken dwellings the life of the Aton-worshippers who once inhabited them. Here in a low brick room, which had served as an archive-chamber for Ikhнатон's Foreign Office, were found in 1887 more than three hundred and fifty cuneiform letters and dispatches in which we can trace his intercourse and dealings with the kings and rulers of Asia, and the gradual disintegration of his empire there. Here were the more than fifty dispatches of the unfortunate Rib-Addi of Byblus. After the modern name of the place, the whole correspondence is generally called the Tell el-Amarna Letters. The systematic excavation of the place has cleared street after street and revealed such houses as the studio of the royal architect Thutmose, with the finest works of sculpture which have survived from the revolution. All the other Aton-cities likewise perished utterly; but Gem-Aton in Nubia flourished for a thousand years, and—strange irony!—there was afterward a temple there to 'Amon, lord of Gem-Aton.'

On reaching Thebes, Tutenkhaton was soon obliged by the priests of Amon to permit the resumption of Amon-worship, and to begin restoring the disfigured names of Amon and the other gods, expunged from the monuments by Ikhнатон. His restora-

tions are found as far south as Soleb in Nubia. Of this work of restoration Tutenkhaton left a record in which he says: 'When his majesty (*i.e.* he himself) was crowned as king, the temples of the gods and goddesses were [desolat]ed from Elephantine as far as the marshes of the Delta.... Their holy places were forsaken (?) and had become overgrown tracts... their sanctuaries were like that which has never been, and their houses were trodden roads. The land was in an evil pass, and as for the gods, they had forsaken this land. If people were sent to Syria to extend the borders of Egypt, they prospered not at all; if men prayed to a god for succour, he came not;... if men besought a goddess likewise, she came not at all.' He was at the same time forced to change his name to Tutenkhamon, 'Living-Image-of-Amon,' while his wife's name similarly became Enkhosnamon ('She-lives-by-Amon'), showing that the new king was at last completely in the hands of the priestly party. The empire which he ruled was still no mean one, extending as it did from the Delta of the Nile to the fourth cataract. He even received occasional tribute from the north which, as his viceroy of Kush, Huy, claimed, came from Syria. He may thus have recovered sufficient power in Palestine to collect some tribute or at least some spoil, which fact may then have been interpreted to include Syria also.

Tutenkhamon reigned at least six years, and it is improbable that he survived much longer. His name is better known than that of any other Pharaoh, owing to the fact that in October, 1922, his tomb and its magnificent equipment were discovered almost intact—the first royal burial ever so found in Egypt¹. It soon became evident that the new material furnished a surprising revelation of the art of that revolutionary movement in Egyptian life, religion and art, which reached its tragic close in the reign of Tutenkhamon. In this revelation lies their chief importance, rather than in any new and direct light on the political history of this troubled time. The condition of the tomb itself is an important item of evidence on political conditions, for the indications are quite clear that Tutenkhamon's tomb was robbed not long after his death, and this fact is a significant revelation of the unsafe conditions which followed his reign².

¹ In the late Earl of Carnarvon's excavations in the Valley of the Kings' Tombs at Thebes, under the immediate direction of Mr Howard Carter. In the whole range of archaeological excavation this is the most important body of materials which has ever fallen to the fortunate lot of the excavator.

² Very important evidence on the political conditions following the death of Tutenkhamon is contained in the extraordinary cuneiform archives

Tutenkhamon was succeeded by another of the worthies of the Akhetaton court, Eye, the master of horse, who had married Ikhnaton's nurse, Tiy. He had laid Tutenkhamon away in his tomb, and one cannot but wonder how much he or his subordinates had to do with its early robbery at a time when all the court and functionaries who officiated at the royal funeral still vividly remembered the splendour of Tutenkhamon's burial equipment. Ere long Eye too passed away, and it would appear that one or two other ephemeral pretenders gained the ascendancy either now or before his accession. Anarchy ensued. Thebes was a prey to plundering bands, who forced their way into the royal cemetery and robbed the tombs of the great emperors. The prestige of the old Theban line which had been dominant for two hundred and fifty years, the illustrious family which two hundred and thirty years before had cast out the Hyksos and built the greatest empire the east had ever seen, was now totally eclipsed (1350 B.C.). Manetho places Harmhab, the restorer who now gained the throne, at the close of the XVIIIth Dynasty; but, so far as we know, he was not of royal blood nor any kin of the now fallen house. His accession marks the complete restoration of the old order and the beginning of a new epoch.

discovered at Boghaz Keui, if we may trust the translations possible at this early stage of our efforts to understand the Hittite language or languages. One of these Hittite tablets, according to the translation of Prof. Sayce (*Ancient Egypt*, 1922, Part III, pp. 66-7), gives an account of an embassy of the 'Egyptians,' whose 'ruler,' named 'Bib-khuru-riyas' had just died. Thereupon the 'queen of Egypt,' named 'Dakhamun,' sent an ambassador to the Hittite court and sought the hand of a Hittite prince in marriage. Prof. Sayce concludes that 'Bib-khuru-riyas' is Tutenkhamon (Nebkhep-rure) and that 'Dakhamun' is 'the queen of Tut-onkh-amen. . . Onkh-s-Amen.' He states further, 'a form Ta-onkh-s-amen might yield Da-kh-amen.' This equation between 'Dakhamun' and an alleged Egyptian, 'Onkh-s-Amen,' is definitely accepted as certain by Prof. Petrie (*ibid.* p. 70) in an appendix to Prof. Sayce's article. It should be noted, however, that the name of Tutenkhamon's queen contains the consonants 'nh-s-n'-mn, which may be approximately vocalized as Enkhos-en-Amon, and that the form discussed by Prof. Sayce and Prof. Petrie omits the consonant n (the preposition 'by' or 'through'). The 'Ta' which this identification proposes to prefix to the name of the queen is presumably the feminine article. It is quite inconceivable that the proposition ('She-lives-by-Amon'), forming the name of the queen, could receive the article, nor does any such form ever appear on the monuments. In view of these difficulties and of the still undeveloped stage of our understanding of Hittite it would seem the better part of caution to employ this Hittite cuneiform document with reserve.

CHAPTER VII

THE AGE OF RAMSES II

I. THE PREDECESSORS OF RAMSES

IN the service of Ikhnaton, as we have already noticed, there had been an able organizer and skilful man of affairs quite after the manner of Thutmose III. Harmhab, as he was called, belonged to an old family once monarchs of Alabastronpolis. He had been entrusted with important missions and had served the royal house with distinction. A man of popularity with the army, he had won also the support of the priesthood of Amon at Thebes. Eventually his power and influence were such that, in the troublous times under Ikhnaton's feeble successors, it was only necessary for him to proceed to Thebes to be recognized as the ruling Pharaoh. The energy which had brought him his exalted office was immediately evident in his administration of it. He was untiring in restoring to the land the orderly organization which it had once enjoyed. After remaining at least two months at Thebes adjusting his affairs there, he sailed for the north to continue this work. 'His majesty sailed down stream....He organized this land, he adjusted it according to the time of Re' (*i.e.* as when the Sun-god was Pharaoh). At the same time he did not forget the temples, which had been so long closed under the Aton régime. 'He restored the temples from the pools of the Delta marshes to Nubia. He shaped all their images in number more than before, increasing the beauty in that which he made. ...He raised up their temples; he fashioned a hundred images with all their bodies correct and with all splendid costly stones. He sought the precincts of the gods which were in the districts in this land; he furnished them as they had been since the time of the first beginning. He established for them daily offerings every day. All the vessels of their temples were wrought of silver and gold. He equipped them with priests and with ritual priests and with the choicest of the army. He transferred to them lands and cattle, supplied with all equipment.' Among other works of this kind he set up a statue of himself and his queen in the temple of Horus of Alabastronpolis on which he frankly recorded the manner in which he had gradually risen from the rank of a simple official of the king to the throne of the Pharaohs.

Thus Amon received again his old endowments and the incomes of all the disinherited temples were restored. The people resumed in public the worship of all the innumerable gods which they had practised in secret during the supremacy of Aton. The sculptors of the king were sent throughout the land continuing the restoration begun by Tutenkhamon, reinserting on the monuments defaced by Ikhnaton the names of the gods whom he had dishonoured and erased. At Thebes Harmhab razed to the ground the temple of Aton and used the materials for building two pylons, extending the temple of Amon on the south; and the materials which he left unused were employed in similar works by his successors. In the ruined pylons of Amon at Karnak to-day one may pick out the blocks which formed the sanctuary of Aton, still bearing the royal names of the despised Aton-worshippers. Everywhere the name of the hated Ikhnaton was treated as he had those of the gods. At Akhetaton his tomb was wrecked and its reliefs chiselled out; while the tombs of his nobles there were violated in the same way. Every effort was made to annihilate all trace of the reign of such a man; and when in legal procedure it was necessary to cite documents or enactments from his reign he was designated as 'that criminal of Akhetaton.' The triumph of Amon was thus complete; as the royal favourites of Ikhnaton had once sung the good fortune of the disciples of Aton, so now Harmhab's courtiers recognized clearly the change in the wind of fortune, and they sang: 'How bountiful are the possessions of him who know the gifts of that god (Amon), the king of gods. Wise is he who knows him, favoured is he who serves him, there is protection for him who follows him.' The priest of Amon, Neferhotep, who uttered these words, was at the moment receiving the richest tokens of the king's favour. Such men exulted in the overthrow of Amon's enemies: 'Woe to him who assails thee! Thy city endures but he who assails thee is overthrown. Fie upon him who sins against thee in any land....The sun of him who knew thee not has set, but he who knows thee shines. The sanctuary of him who assailed thee is overwhelmed in darkness, but the whole earth is in light.'

There were other directions in which the restoration of what Harmhab regarded as normal conditions was not so easy. Gross laxity in the supervision of the local administration had characterized the reign of Ikhnaton and his successors; and those abuses which always arise under such conditions in the Orient had grown to excess. Everywhere the local officials, long secure from close inspection on the part of the central government, had revelled in

extortions, practised upon the long-suffering masses, until the fiscal and administrative system was honey-combed with bribery and corruption of all sorts. To ameliorate these conditions Harmhab first informed himself thoroughly as to the extent and character of the evils, and then in his private chamber he dictated to his personal scribe a remarkable series of highly specialized laws to suit every case of which he had learned. They were all directed against the practice of extortion from the poor by fiscal and administrative officials. The penalties were severe. A tax-collector found guilty of dealing thus with the poor man was sentenced to have his nose cut off, followed by banishment to Tharu, the desolate frontier city far out in the sands of the Arabian desert toward Asia. The troops used in administration and stationed in the north and south were accustomed to steal the hides of the Pharaoh's loan-herds from the peasants responsible for them. 'They went out from house to house, beating and plundering without leaving a hide.' In every such demonstrable case the new law enacted that the peasant should not be held responsible for the hides by the Pharaoh's overseer of cattle. The guilty soldier was severely dealt with: 'As for any citizen of the army concerning whom one shall hear, saying: "he goeth about stealing hides"; beginning with this day the law shall be executed against him by beating with a hundred blows, opening five wounds, and taking away the hides which he took.'

One of the greatest difficulties connected with the discovery of such local misgovernment was collusion with the local officials by inspecting officers sent out by the central government. The corrupt superiors, for a share in the plunder, would overlook the very extortions which they had been sent on journeys of inspection to discover and prevent. This evil had been rooted out in the days of the aggressive Thutmose III, but it was now rampant again, and Harmhab apparently revived the methods of Thutmose III for controlling it. In the introduction and application of the new laws Harmhab went personally from end to end of the kingdom. At the same time he improved the opportunity to look for fitting men with whom he could lodge the responsibility for an efficient administration of justice. In order to discourage bribery among the local judges he took an unprecedented step. He remitted the tax of gold and silver levied upon all local officials for judicial duties, permitting them to retain the entire income of their offices, in order that they might have no excuse for illegally enriching themselves. But he went still further; while organizing the local courts throughout the land he passed a most

stringent law against the acceptance of any bribe by a member of a local court or 'council'; 'Now, as for any official or any priest concerning whom it shall be heard, saying: "He sits to execute judgment among the council appointed for judgment and he commits a crime against justice therein"; it shall be counted against him as a capital crime. Behold my majesty has done this to improve the laws of Egypt.' In order to keep his executive officials in close touch with himself, as well as to lift them above all necessity of accepting any income from a corrupt source, Harmhab had them provided for with great liberality. They went out on inspection several times a month, and on these occasions, either just before their departure or immediately after their return, the king gave them a sumptuous feast in the palace court, appearing himself upon the balcony, addressing each man by name and throwing down gifts among them. These sane and philanthropic reforms give Harmhab a high place in the history of humane government; especially when we remember that, even since the occupation of the country by the English, the evils at which he struck have been found exceedingly persistent and difficult to root out.

If Harmhab had any ambition to leave a reputation as a conqueror, the times were against him. His accession fell at a time when all his powers and all his great ability were necessarily employed exclusively in reorganizing the kingdom after the long period of unparalleled laxity which preceded him. He performed his task with a strength and skill not less than were required for great conquest abroad; while at the same time he showed a spirit of humane solicitude for the amelioration of the conditions among the masses, which has never been surpassed in Egypt, from his time until the present day. Although a soldier, with all the qualities which that calling implies in the Ancient East, yet, when he became king, he could truly say: 'Behold his majesty spent the whole time seeking the welfare of Egypt.' A list of names of foreign countries on the wall near his great code of laws contains the conventional enumeration of conquests abroad, which are probably not to be taken very seriously; the name of the Hittites appears among them, but later conditions show that he could have accomplished no effective retrenchment of their power in Syria. On the contrary, we should possibly place in his reign the treaty of alliance and friendship, referred to by Ramses II some fifty years later, as having existed before. Harmhab therefore seems to have enjoyed a long and peaceful reign. In the days of Ramses II the reigns of Ikhnaton and the other Aton-worshippers

had apparently been added to Harmhab's reign, increasing it by twenty-five years or more, so that a lawsuit of the former's time refers to events of the 'fifty-ninth year' of Harmhab. He therefore probably reigned some thirty-five years.

Whether or not Harmhab succeeded in founding a dynasty we do not know. It is impossible to discover any certain connection between him and Ramses I, who now (1315 B.C.) succeeded him. Seemingly too old to accomplish anything, it was, nevertheless, this aged king who planned and began the vast colonnaded hall, the famous hypostyle of Karnak, afterwards continued and completed by his successors. In his second year he found the new responsibility beyond his strength and he associated as co-regent with himself his son Seti I, then probably about thirty years old.

Within a year after the establishment of the co-regency the old king died (1314 B.C.). Seti I must have already laid all his plans and organized his army in readiness for an attempt to recover the lost empire of Asia. The information which Seti I now received as to the state of the country betrays a condition of affairs quite such as we should expect would have resulted from the tendency already evident in the letters of Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem to Ikhнатon. They showed us the Bedouins of the neighbouring desert pressing into Palestine and taking possession of the towns, whether in the service of the turbulent dynasts or on their own responsibility. These letters were corroborated by Egyptian monuments, portraying the panic-stricken Palestinians fleeing into Egypt before their foes. Seti I's messengers now brought him information of the very same character regarding the Bedouins. They reported: 'Their tribal chiefs are in coalition and they are gaining a foothold in Palestine; they have taken to cursing and quarrelling, each of them slaying his neighbour, and they disregard the laws of the palace.' It was among these desert invaders that, as some authorities think, the movement of the Hebrews took place which resulted in the settlement of Palestine.

Seti was able to march out from Tharu in his first year, and as he reached the frontier of Canaan—the name applied by the Egyptians to all western Palestine and Syria—he captured a walled town, which marked the northern limit of the struggle with the Bedouins. Thence he pushed rapidly northward, capturing the towns of the plain of Megiddo (Jezreel), pushing eastward across the valley of the Jordan and erecting his tablet of victory in the Hauran, and westward to the southern slopes of Lebanon, where he took the forest-girt city of Yenoam, once the property of the temple of Amon, after its capture by Thutmose III, nearly

one hundred and fifty years before. The neighbouring dynasts of the Lebanon immediately came to him and offered their allegiance. They had not seen a Pharaoh at the head of his army in Asia for over fifty years—not since Amenhotep III had left Sidon; and Seti immediately put them to the test by requiring a liberal contribution of cedar logs. In Seti's Karnak reliefs we see the subjects of the Lebanon felling these logs in his presence, and he was able to send them to Egypt by water from the harbours which, like his great predecessor, Thutmose III, he was now subduing. Having thus secured at least the southern Phoenician coast and restored the water-route between Syria and Egypt for future operations, Seti returned to Egypt.

The return of a victorious Pharaoh from conquest in Asia, so common in the days of the great conquerors, was now a spectacle which few living Egyptians had seen. At Tharu outside the gate of the frontier fortress beside the bridge over the fresh-water canal, which already connected the Nile with the Bitter Lakes of the Isthmus of Suez, the leading men of Seti's government gathered in a rejoicing group, and as the weary lines toiled up in the dust of the long desert march, with the Pharaoh at their head, driving before his chariot-horses the captive dynasts of Palestine and Syria, the nobles broke out in acclamation. At Thebes there was festive presentation of prisoners and spoil before Amon, such as had been common enough in the days of the empire, but which the Thebans had not witnessed for fifty years or more. This campaign seems to have been sufficient to restore southern Palestine to the kingdom of the Pharaoh, and probably also most of northern Palestine.

The western border of the Delta, from the earliest times open to Libyan invasion, was always a more or less uncertain frontier. Seti spent his entire next year, the second of his reign, in the Delta, and it is very probable that he carried on operations against the Libyans in that year. In any case, we next find him in Galilee, storming the walled city of Kadesh, which must not be confused with Kadesh on the Orontes. Here the Amorite kingdom founded by Abd-Ashirta and Aziru (p. 123) formed a kind of buffer state; and to it belonged the Galilean Kadesh, lying between Palestine on the south and the southern Hittite frontier in the Orontes valley on the north. It was necessary for Seti to subdue this intermediate kingdom before he could come to blows with the Hittites lying behind it. After harrying its territory and probably taking Kadesh, Seti pushed northward against the Hittites. Their king, Shubbiluliuma (Egyptian Seplel), who had entered

into treaty relations with Egypt toward the close of the XVIIIth Dynasty, was now long dead; his son, Murshil (Egyptian Merasar) was probably ruling in his stead. Somewhere in the Orontes valley Seti came into contact with them, and the first battle between the Hittites and a Pharaoh occurred. Of the character and magnitude of the action we know nothing; we have only a battle-relief showing Seti in full career charging the enemy in his chariot. It is, however, not probable that he met the main army of the Hittites; certain it is that he did not shake their power in Syria; Kadesh on the Orontes and all Syria north of Palestine remained in their hands, just as they had conquered it at the close of the XVIIIth Dynasty. At most, Seti could not have accomplished more than drive back their extreme advance, thus preventing them from absorbing any more territory on the south or pushing southward into Palestine. He returned to Thebes for another triumph, driving his Hittite prisoners before him, and presenting them, with the spoil, to the god of the empire, Amon of Karnak. The boundary which he had established in Asia roughly coincided inland with the northern limits of Palestine, and must have included also Tyre and the Phoenician coast south of the mouth of the Litāny. Though much increasing the territory of Egypt in Asia, it represented but a small third of what she had once conquered there. Under these circumstances it would have been quite natural for Seti to continue the war in Syria. For some reason, however, he did not, so far as we know, ever appear with his forces in Asia again. He may have perceived the changed conditions and understood that the methods which had built up the empire of Thutmose III could no longer apply with a power of the first rank like that of the Hittites already occupying Syria. He therefore, either at this time or later, negotiated a treaty of peace with the Hittite king, probably Mutallu (Egyptian Metella), who had succeeded his father, Murshil.

At home Seti still found much to do in merely restoring the disfigured monuments of his ancestors surviving from the Aton revolution, which he did with characteristic piety. All the larger monuments of the XVIIIth Dynasty from the Nubian temple of Amada on the south to Bubastis on the north, bear records of his restoration. At all the great sanctuaries of the old gods his buildings were now rising on a scale unprecedented in the palmiest days of the empire—a fact which shows that the income, even of the reduced empire of Seti I, reaching from the fourth cataract of the Nile to the sources of the Jordan, was still sufficient to support

enterprises of imperial scope. He continued the vast colonnaded hall at Karnak planned and begun by his father. It surpassed in size even the enormous unfinished hypostyle of Amenhotep III at Luxor. On the outside of the north wall his sculptors engraved a colossal series of reliefs portraying his campaigns. Mounting from the base to the coping they cover the entire wall, over two hundred feet in length. Similar works existed in the XVIIIth Dynasty temples, but they have all perished, and Seti's battle-reliefs therefore form the most imposing work of the kind now surviving in Egypt. The great hall which it was to adorn was never finished by him, and it was left to his successors to complete it. Like his fathers of the XVIIIth Dynasty, he erected a large mortuary temple on the western plain of Thebes. It was located at the northern end of the line of similar sanctuaries left by the earlier kings, and as Seti's father had died too soon to construct any such temple, it was also dedicated to him. This temple, now known as that of Kurna, was likewise left incomplete by Seti. At Abydos he built a magnificent sanctuary dedicated to the great gods of the empire, the Osirian triad and himself. Although this temple has lost the first and second pylons, its sculptures make it perhaps the noblest monument of Egyptian art still surviving in the land. A temple at Memphis, probably another at Heliopolis, with doubtless others in the Delta of which we know nothing, and in Nubia an enormous cliff-temple at Abu Simbel, left incomplete and afterward finished by his son, Ramses II, completed the series of Seti's greater buildings. The remarkable art, especially the sculpture and painting, preserved in these and other monuments of Seti's reign show clear evidences of the influence of Ikhnaton's Amarna school of art. Indeed the artistic works of Seti's time are hardly thinkable without the influence of the Amarna age.

These works drew heavily on his treasury, and when he reached the point of permanently endowing the mortuary service of the Abydos temple, he found it necessary to seek additional sources of income. He therefore turned his attention to the possible resources and found that the supply of gold from the mountains of the Red Sea region in the district of Gebel Zebāra was seriously restricted by lack of water along the desert route. At the main station, some thirty-seven miles east of Edfu, a well was dug under his own superintendence, yielding a plentiful supply of water. In all probability other stations farther out on the same route were erected. Then Seti established the income from the mines thus reached as a permanent endowment for his temple at Abydos,

and called down terrifying curses on any posterity who should violate his enactments. Yet within a year after his death they had ceased to be effective and had to be renewed by his son. In a similar effort to replenish his treasury from gold mines farther south in the Wadi Alāki, Seti dug a well two hundred feet deep on the road leading south-east from Kubbān, but he failed to reach water, and the attempt to increase the gold-supply from this region was evidently unsuccessful.

Seti I seems to have spent his energies chiefly upon his extensive buildings, and beyond his ninth year we know practically nothing of his reign. He did not forget the excavation of a vast tomb for himself in the Valley of the Kings at Thebes, exceeded in the length of its gallery only by that of Hatshepsut. It is of complicated construction and descends into the mountain through a series of galleries and extensive halls no less than four hundred and seventy feet in oblique depth. The king's later years were disturbed by a conflict between his eldest son and the latter's younger brother, Ramses, over the succession. Ramses, born to Seti by one of his queens named Tuya, was plotting to supplant his eldest brother, and during their father's last days laid his plans so effectively that he was ready for a successful *coup* at the old king's death. Some time before his approaching jubilee, while the obelisks for it were still unfinished, Seti died (about 1292 B.C.), having reigned over twenty years since his own father's death. He was laid to rest in a sumptuous sarcophagus of alabaster in the splendid tomb which he had excavated in the western valley. Preserved by happy accident, the body, like many others of the Pharaohs whom we have seen, shows him to have been one of the stateliest figures that ever sat upon the throne of Egypt.

II. THE WARS AND FOREIGN RELATIONS OF RAMSES II

Whether the elder brother gained the throne long enough to have his figure inserted in his father's reliefs, where we now find traces of it, or whether his influence as crown prince had accomplished this, we cannot tell. In any case Ramses brushed him aside without a moment's hesitation and seized the throne. The only public evidence of his brother's claims—his figure inserted by that of Seti in the battle with the Libyans—was immediately erased with the inscriptions which stated his name and titles; while in their stead the artists of Ramses II inserted the figure of

their new lord, with the title 'crown prince,' which he had never borne. The colour which once carefully veiled all traces of these alterations has now long since disappeared, disclosing the evidence of the bitter conflict of the two princes still discernible on the north wall of the Karnak hypostyle. Such was the accession of the famous Pharaoh, Ramses II. But the usual court devices were immediately resorted to, that the manner of the Pharaoh's actual conquest of the throne might be forgotten. When Ramses addressed the court he alluded specifically to the day when his father had set him as a child before the nobles and proclaimed him the heir to the kingdom. The grandees knew too well the road to favour not to respond in fulsome eulogies enlarging on the wonderful powers of the king in his childhood and narrating how he had even commanded the army at ten years of age. The young monarch showed great vigour and high abilities, and if his unfortunate rival left a party to dispute his claims, no trace of their opposition is now discoverable.

Hastening at once to Thebes, the seat of power, Ramses lost no time in making himself strong there, especially gaining the support of the priests of Amon. He devoted himself also, with great zeal to pious works in memory of his father at Thebes and especially at Abydos, where he found his father's magnificent mortuary temple in a sad state; it was without roof, the drums of the columns and the blocks for the half-raised walls lay scattered in the mire, and the whole monument, left thus unfinished by Seti, was fast going to destruction. He carried out his father's plans and completed the temple, at the same time renewing the landed endowments and reorganizing the administration of its property to which Ramses now added herds, the tribute of fowls and fishermen, a trading-ship on the Red Sea, a fleet of barges on the river, slaves and serfs, with priests and officials for the management of the temple-estate. Perhaps the heavy draughts upon his treasury entailed by the mortuary endowments of his father now moved Ramses to look for new sources of income. However this may be, we find him at Memphis in his third year consulting with his officials regarding the possibility of opening up the Wadi Alāki country in Nubia and developing there the gold mines which Seti I had unsuccessfully attempted to exploit. The result of the ensuing royal command was a letter from the viceroy of Kush announcing the complete success of the undertaking. Such enterprises of internal exploitation were but preparatory in the plans of Ramses. His ambition held him to greater purposes; and he contemplated nothing less than the

recovery of the great Asiatic empire, conquered by his predecessors of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

When Ramses II ascended the throne the Hittites had remained in undisputed possession of their Syrian conquests for probably more than twenty years, since the attempt of Seti I to dislodge them. The long peace had given their king, Mutallu, an opportunity, of which he made good use, to render their position in Syria impregnable. Advancing southward, up the valley of the Orontes, he had seized Kadesh, the centre of the Syrian power in the days of Thutmose III, which, we remember, had given him more trouble and held out with more tenacious resistance than any other kingdom in Syria. We have already seen the strategic importance of the district, an importance which was quickly grasped by the Hittite king, who made the place the bulwark of his southern frontier. Ramses's plan for the war was like that of his great ancestor, Thutmose III: he proposed first to gain the coast, that he might use one of its harbours as a base, enjoying quick and easy communication with Egypt by water. Our sources tell us nothing of his operations on the first campaign, when this purpose was accomplished. We have only the evidence of a limestone stela cut into the face of the rock overlooking the Dog River a few miles north of Beirut. The monument is so weathered that only the name of Ramses II and the date in the 'year four' can be read. It was in that year, there (1289 B.C.), that Ramses pushed northward along the coast of Phoenicia to this point. Unfortunately for Ramses, this preparatory campaign, however necessary, gave the Hittite king, Mutallu, an opportunity to collect all his resources and to muster all available forces from every possible source¹. All the vassal kings of his extensive empire were compelled to contribute their levies to his army. We find among them the old enemies of Egypt in Syria: the kings of Naharin, Arvad, Carchemish, Kode, Kadesh, Nuges (Nukhashshi?), Ekereth (Ugarit), the unknown Mesheneth, and Aleppo. Besides these, Mutallu's subject or allied kingdoms in Asia Minor, like Kezweden (Kissuwadna) and Pedes (Pidasa), were drawn upon; and, not content with the army thus collected, he emptied his treasury to tempt the mercenaries of Asia Minor and the Mediterranean islands. Roving bands of Lycian sailors, such as had plundered the coasts of the Levant in the XVIIIth Dynasty, besides Mysians, Cilicians, Dardanians, and levies of the unidentified Erwenet (? Oroanda north-west of Cilicia), took service

The fragmentary cuneiform account from Boghaz Keui (p. 147 n.) would indicate that Mutallu himself was Ramses' opponent in this battle.

in the Hittite ranks (cf. p. 281). In this manner Mutallû collected an army more formidable than any which Egypt had ever hitherto been called upon to meet. In numbers it was large for those times, containing probably not less than twenty thousand men.

Ramses on his part had not been less active in securing mercenary support. From the remote days of the Old Kingdom Nubian levies had been common in Egyptian service. Among the troops used to garrison Syria in the days of the Amarna Letters sixty years before, we find the 'Sherden' (Shardina), and, as we learn from a Boghaz Keui tablet, the men of Melukhkha. The Sherden were now taken into Ramses' army in considerable numbers, so that they constituted a recognized element in it, and the king levied 'his infantry, his chariotry and the Sherden.' He must have commanded an army of not less than twenty thousand men all told, although the proportion of mercenaries is unknown to us, nor is it known what proportion of his force was chariotry, as compared with the infantry. He divided these troops into four divisions, each named after one of the great gods: Amon, Re, Ptah and Sutekh; and himself took personal command of the division of Amon. In the spring of his fifth year (1288 B.C.), when the rains of Syria had ceased, Ramses appeared with his army in the valley of the upper Orontes between the two Lebanons, overlooking the vast plain in which lay Kadesh, only a day's march distant, with its battlements probably visible on the northern horizon, toward which the Orontes wound its way across the plain. Putting himself at the head of the division of Amon, early in the day Ramses left the other divisions to follow after while he set out down the last slope of the high valley (the *Beka'*) to the ford of the Orontes at Shabtuna, later known to the Hebrews as Riblah. Here the river left the precipitous, cañon-like wadi in which it had hitherto flowed, and for the first time permitted a crossing to the west side on which Kadesh was, thus enabling an army approaching the city from the south to cut off a considerable bend in the river. At this juncture two Bedouins of the region appeared and stated that they had deserted from the Hittite ranks, and that the Hittite king had retreated northward to the district of Aleppo, north of Tunip. In view of the failure of his scouting parties to find the enemy, and the impressions of his officers coinciding with the report of the Bedouins, Ramses readily believed this story, immediately crossed the river with the division of Amon and pushed rapidly on, while the divisions of Re, Ptah and Sutekh, marching in the order named, straggled far behind. Anxious to reach Kadesh and begin the siege that day, the Pharaoh even

drew away from the division of Amon and with no van before him, accompanied only by his household troops, was rapidly nearing Kadesh as midday approached.

Meantime Mutallu, the Hittite king, had drawn up his troops in battle-array on the north-west of Kadesh, and Ramses, without a hint of danger, was approaching the entire Hittite force, while the bulk of his army was scattered along the road some eight or ten miles in the rear, and the officers of Re and Ptah were resting in the shade of the neighbouring forests after the hot and dusty march. The crafty Hittite, seeing that the story of his two Bedouins, whom he had sent out for the very purpose of deceiving Ramses, had been implicitly accepted, improved his shrewdly gained opportunity to the full. He did not attack Ramses at once, but as the Pharaoh approached the city the Hittite quickly transferred his entire army to the east side of the river, and while Ramses passed northward along the west side of Kadesh, Mutallu deftly dodged him, moving southward along the east side of the city, always keeping it between him and the Egyptians to prevent his troops from being seen. As he drew in on the east and south-east of the city he had secured a position on Ramses' flank which was of itself enough to ensure him an overwhelming victory. The Egyptian forces were now roughly divided into two groups: near Kadesh were the two divisions of Amon and Re, while far southward the divisions of Ptah and Sutekh had not yet crossed at the ford of Shabtuna. The division of Sutekh was so far away that nothing more was heard of it and it took no part in the day's action. Ramses himself halted on the north-west of the city, not far from and perhaps on the very ground occupied by the Asiatic army a short time before. Here he camped in the early afternoon, and the division of Amon, coming up shortly afterward, bivouacked around his tent.

The weary troops were resting, feeding their horses and preparing their own meal, when two Asiatic spies were brought in by Ramses' scouts, and taken to the royal tent. Brought before Ramses they confessed, after a merciless beating, that Mutallu and his entire army were concealed behind the city. Thoroughly alarmed, the young Pharaoh hastily summoned his commanders and officials, chided them bitterly for their inability to inform him of the presence of the enemy, and commanded the vizier to bring up the division of Ptah with all speed. His dispatch to the division of Ptah alone, shows that Ramses had no hope of bringing up the division of Sutekh, which was, as we have seen, straggling far in the rear above Shabtuna. At the same time it discloses his con-

fidence that the division of Re, which had been but a few miles behind him at most, was within call at the gates of his camp. He therefore at this juncture little dreamed of the desperate situation into which he had been betrayed, nor of the catastrophe which at that very moment was overtaking the unfortunate division of Re. Issuing on the south side of Kadesh, the chariotry of Mutallu struck the division of Re on the march, broke it in two and cut it to pieces. Of the remnants some fled northward toward Ramses' camp in a wild rout. They had at the first moment sent a messenger to inform Ramses of the catastrophe, but in so far as we know, the first intimation received by the Pharaoh of the appalling disaster which now faced him was the headlong flight of these fugitives of the annihilated division, among whom were two of his own sons. They burst into the astonished camp with the Hittite chariotry close upon their heels in hot pursuit. Ramses' heavy infantry guard quickly dragged these intruders from their chariots and dispatched them; but behind these were swiftly massing the whole body of some twenty-five hundred Asiatic chariots. As they pressed in upon the Egyptian position their wings rapidly spread, swelled out on either hand and enfolded the camp. The division of Amon, weary with the long and rapid march, in total relaxation, without arms and without officers, was struck as by an avalanche when the fleeing remnants of the division of Re swept through the camp. Inevitably involved in the rout, they were carried along with it to the northward.

The bulk of Ramses' available force was thus in flight, his southern divisions were miles away and separated from him by the whole mass of the enemy's chariotry. The disaster was complete. Taken thus with but short shrift, the young Pharaoh hesitated not a moment in attempting to cut his way out and to reach his southern columns. With only his household troops, his immediate followers and the officers, who happened to be at his side, he mounted his waiting chariot and boldly charged into the advance of the Hittite pursuit as it poured into his camp on the west side. He perceived at once how heavily the enemy was massed before him, and immediately understood that further onset in that direction was hopeless. Retiring into the camp again, he must have noted how thin was the eastern wing of the surrounding chariots along the river, where there had not yet been time for the enemy to strengthen their line. As a forlorn hope he charged this line with an impetuosity that hurled the Asiatics in his immediate front pell-mell into the river. Mutallu, standing on the opposite shore amid a mass of eight thousand

2. AMARNA LETTERS MAP 1

Naharin, C. 3
 Nazana, 7; B, 5
 Nuhshahin, C. 2

 Ono, A. 6
 Orontes, B. 4, C. 2, 3, 4
 Otara's, C. 6

 Purasati, A. 6, B. 6

 Raman(ah), B. 4, 5
 Rarhna, Raped, A. 7
 Redah, tell, A. 7
 Retnu (Retnu) Upper (7), B. 5, 7, C. 5

 Sa'arai, B. 8
 sa-Sāhān, tell, A. 7
 Saūdi, B. 6
 Sakema, B. 6
 Samarai, A. 4
 Samara, B. 6
 Sarduna(a), B. 6
 Sar[ul], B. 5
 Saško, A. 7
 Sechastive, B. 6
 Seinhn, B. 1
 Sety I, Monumen "d, C. 6
 Sharipen, Sharzhan, A
 Shinoz (7), Mt., B. 5
 sh-Shahk Sal' (7)
 Sidon, B. 5
 Sidim[ul], -n, B. 5
 Smaara, C. 3
 Sumur, B. 4
 Šur[ur], B. 5


 Tabaryye, Bahr, B. 6
 Tabor, B. 6
 Tarsus, A. 2
 Taurus, C. 1
 Timaah, Timaak C. 5
 et Tör, J, B. 6
 Tump See Dump
 Tyre, B. 5

 Ulu, C. 5
 Ung, C. 4
 Urusalm, B. 7
 Urd, B. 5


 W-z-tree (7), basis of the, C. 2

 Yāin, A. 6
 Yapp, A. 6
 Yar(a)dm(a), B. 6, 7
 Yarnat, C. 1
 Y(a)rdai, B. 6

 Zahi, B. 3, 4, 5
 Zakhar, A. 6
 Zanjirli, C. 1
 Zpuna, B. 5



infantry, saw several of his officers, his personal scribe, his charioteer, the chief of his body-guard and finally even his own royal brother go down before the Pharaoh's furious onset. Among many rescued from the water by their comrades on the opposite shore was the half-drowned king of Aleppo, who was with difficulty resuscitated by his troops. Again and again Ramses renewed the charge along the river on his east, finally producing serious discomfiture in the enemy's line at this point.



The Two Stages in the Battle of Kadesh. (Breasted.)

At this juncture an incident common in oriental warfare saved the Pharaoh from total destruction. Had the mass of the Hittite chariotry swept in upon his rear from the west and south he must certainly have been lost. But to his great good fortune his camp had now fallen into the hands of these troops and, dismounting from their chariots, they had thrown discipline to the winds as they gave themselves up to the rich plunder. Thus engaged, they were suddenly fallen upon by a body of Ramses' recruits, reinforcements of uncertain origin, who may possibly have marched

in from the coast to join his army at Kadesh. In any case, they did not belong to either of the southern divisions. They completely surprised the plundering Asiatics in the camp and slew them to a man. The sudden offensive of Ramses along the river and the unexpected onslaught of the 'recruits' must have considerably dampened the ardour of the Hittite attack, giving the Pharaoh an opportunity to recover himself. These newly-arrived 'recruits,' together with the returning fugitives from the unharmed but scattered division of Amon, so augmented his power that there was now a prospect of his maintaining himself until the arrival of the division of Ptah. The stubborn defence which followed forced the Hittite king to throw in his reserves of a thousand chariots. Six times the desperate Pharaoh charged into the replenished lines of the enemy, but for some reason Mutallu did not send against him the eight thousand foot which he had stationed on the east side of the river opposite Ramses' position; and the struggle remained a battle of chariotry as long as we can trace it. For several hours, by prodigies of personal valour, the Pharaoh kept his scanty forces together, doubtless throwing many an anxious glance southward toward the road from Shabtuna, along which the division of Ptah was toiling in response to his message. Finally, as the long afternoon wore on and the sun was low in the west, the standards of Ptah glimmering through the dust and heat gladdened the eyes of the weary Pharaoh. Caught between the opposing lines, the Hittite chariotry was driven into the city, probably with considerable loss; but our sources unfortunately do not permit us to follow these closing incidents of the battle. As evening drew on the enemy took refuge in the city and Ramses was saved. The prisoners taken were led before him while he reminded his followers that these captives had been brought off by himself almost single handed.

The records describe how the scattered Egyptian fugitives crept back and found the plain strewn with Asiatic dead, especially of the personal and official circle about the Hittite king. This was undoubtedly true; the Asiatics must have lost heavily in Ramses' camp, on the river north of the city and at the arrival of the division of Ptah; but Ramses' loss was certainly far heavier than that of his enemies. If the Pharaoh could claim any success to offset the disaster he had suffered, it was his salvation from utter destruction, and the fact that he eventually held possession of the field added little practical advantage. It is commonly stated that Ramses captured Kadesh, but there is no such claim in any of his records.

In spite of the lack of caution which cost him so dearly, Ramses was very proud of his exploit at Kadesh. Throughout Egypt on his more important buildings he commissioned his sculptors to depict what were to him and his fawning courtiers the most important incidents of the battle. On the temple walls at Abu Simbel, at Derr, at the Ramesseum, his mortuary temple at Thebes, at Luxor, at Karnak, at Abydos, and probably on other buildings now perished, his artists executed a vast series of vivacious reliefs picturing Ramses' camp, the arrival of his fugitive sons, the Pharaoh's furious charge down to the river and the arrival of the recruits who rescued the camp. Before Ramses' chariot the plain is strewn with Asiatic dead, among whom the accompanying bits of explanatory description furnish the identity of the notable personages whom we have mentioned above. On the opposite shore where their comrades draw the fugitives from the water a tall figure held head downward that he may disgorge the water which he has swallowed is accompanied by the words: 'The wretched chief of Aleppo, turned upside down by his soldiers, after his majesty had hurled him into the water.' These sculptures are better known to modern travellers in Egypt than any other like monuments in the country. There early arose also a prose-poem on the battle, of which we shall later have more to say. The ever-repeated refrain in all these records is the valiant stand of the young Pharaoh: 'while he was alone, having no army with him.' These sources have enabled us to trace with certainty the steps which led up to the battle of Kadesh, the first battle in history which can be so studied; and this fact must serve as our justification for treating it at such length¹. We see that already in the thirteenth century B.C. the commanders of the time understood the value of clever manœuvres masked from the enemy, as illustrated in the first flank movement of which we hear in the history of military strategy; and the plains of Syria, already at this remote epoch, witnessed notable examples of that supposed modern strategical science which was brought to such perfection by Napoleon—the science of winning the victory before the battle.

While Ramses enjoyed the usual triumph in the state-temple, his return to Egypt immediately after the battle without even laying siege to Kadesh, after having lost nearly a whole division of his army, even though he had shown a brilliant defence, could only be destructive of Egyptian influence among the dynasts of

¹ What is evidently a Hittite version of the battle has been found among the tablets of Boghaz Keui. See p. 265.

Syria and Palestine. Nor would the Hittites fail to make every possible use of the doubtful battle to undermine that influence and stir up revolt. Seti I had secured northern Palestine as Egyptian territory, and this region was so near the valley of the Orontes that the emissaries of the Hittites had little difficulty in exciting it to revolt. The rising spread southward to the very gates of Ramses' frontier forts in the north-eastern Delta. We see him, therefore, far from increasing the conquests of his father, obliged to begin again at the very bottom to rebuild the Egyptian empire in Asia and recover by weary campaigns even the territory which his father had won. Our sources for this period are very scanty and the order of events is not wholly certain, but Ramses seems first to have attacked what was later the Philistine city of Askalon and taken it by storm. By his eighth year he had forced his way through to northern Palestine, and we then find him plundering the cities of western Galilee, one after another. Here he came again into contact with the Hittite outposts, which had been pushed far southward since the day of Kadesh. He found a Hittite garrison in the strong town of Deper, which seems to be the Tabor of Hebrew history; but assisted by his sons he assaulted and took the place, and the Hittite occupation of the region could have endured but a short time. It was perhaps at this time that he penetrated into the Hauran and the region east of the Sea of Galilee and left a stela there recording his visit (p. 319). Ramses was thus obliged to campaign for three years in the recovery of Palestine.

The Pharaoh was thereupon at liberty to resume his ambitious designs in Asia at the point where he had begun them four years earlier. Advancing again down the valley of the Orontes, he must finally have succeeded in dislodging the Hittites. None of the scanty records of the time states this fact; but as he made conquests far north of Kadesh that place must certainly have fallen into his hands. In Naharin he conquered the country as far as Tunip, where he gained reputation by deliberately entering battle without his corselet. But these places had been too long exempt from tribute to the Pharaoh to take kindly to his yoke. Moreover, they were now occupied by Hittites, who doubtless continued to reside there under the rule of Ramses. His lists credit him with having subdued Naharin, Lower Retenu (North Syria), Arvad, the Keftiu, and Ketne in the Orontes valley. It is thus evident that Ramses' ability and tenacity as a soldier had now really endangered the Hittite empire in Syria, although it is very uncertain whether he succeeded in holding these northern conquests.

When he had been thus campaigning probably some fifteen years an important event in the internal history of the Hittite empire brought his wars in Asia to a sudden and final end. Mutallu, the Hittite king, in some way met his death, and his brother, Hattushil, succeeded him upon the throne. Hattushil displayed a statesmanlike understanding of the international situation in Asia. He at once grasped the fact that the collapse of Mitanni had exposed the eastern Hittite frontier directly to the attacks of Assyria. The invasion of Shalmaneser I, who at this junction plundered Mitanni and other subject peoples of Hattushil, and brought a powerful Assyrian army for the first time to the Euphrates, was an event which the Hittite king quite well understood. While pushing old-time friendly relations with Babylonia, he took steps to terminate the war with Egypt and to substitute for it a treaty of permanent peace and alliance between Egypt and the Hittites. In Ramses' twenty-first year (1272 B.C.) Hattushil's messengers bearing the treaty reached the Egyptian court, which had been permanently shifted to the Delta. The treaty which they bore had of course been drafted in advance and accepted by representatives of the two countries, for it was now in its final form: eighteen paragraphs inscribed on a silver tablet, surmounted by a representation showing engraved or inlaid figures of 'Sutekh embracing the likeness of the great chief of Kheta'; and of a goddess similarly embracing the figure of Hattushil's queen, Putukhipa; while beside these were the seals of Sutekh of Kheta, Re of Ernen, as well as those of the two royal personages.

It bore the title: 'The treaty which the great chief of Kheta, Khetasar (cuneiform Hattushil), the valiant, the son of Merasar (cuneiform Murshil), the great chief of Kheta, the valiant, the grandson of Seplel (cuneiform Shubbiluliuma), the great chief of Kheta, the valiant, made, upon a silver tablet for Usermare-Setepnere (*i.e.* Ramses II), the great ruler of Egypt, the valiant, the son of Seti I, the great ruler of Egypt, the valiant; the grandson of Ramses I, the great ruler of Egypt, the valiant; the good treaty of peace and of brotherhood, setting peace between them forever.' After a review of the former relations between the two countries, it passed to a general definition of the present pact, and thus to its special stipulations. Of these the most important were: the renunciation by both rulers of all projects of conquest against the other, the reaffirmation of the former treaties existing between the two countries, a defensive alliance involving the assistance of each against the other's foes, co-opera-

tion in the chastisement of delinquent subjects, probably in Syria; and the extradition of political fugitives and immigrants. A codicil provided for the humane treatment of the last-named. A thousand gods and goddesses of the land of the Hittites, and the same number from the land of Egypt were called upon to witness the compact, some of the more important Hittite divinities being mentioned by the names of their cities. The remarkable document closes with a curse on the violators of the treaty and a blessing upon those who should keep it—or it would logically so close save that the codicil already mentioned is here attached. Ramses had copies of the treaty engraved on the walls of his temples at Thebes, preceded by an account of the coming of the Hittite messengers, and followed by a description of the figures and other representations depicted on the silver tablet. Two such copies have been found at Thebes, one at Karnak and the other at the Ramesseum, although the latter has since perished. One of the most remarkable achievements of modern excavation has been the discovery of a cuneiform transcript of this treaty in the archives of the Hittite kings at Boghaz Keui (see p. 266).

The cuneiform archives of Boghaz Keui show that the Hittite king retained control of Amor, just north of Palestine. Although the treaty does not take up the boundary question, it is evident that, notwithstanding Ramses II's advance far into Naharin, he was unable to hold the conquests which he had made there. He had, therefore, not permanently advanced the boundary of his father's kingdom in Asia, and the Egyptian frontier, as determined by the new peace, will not have been far north of the northern confines of Palestine. The Hittite king is recognized in the treaty as on an equality with the Pharaoh and received the same conditions; but, as commonly in the Orient, the whole transaction was interpreted by Ramses on his monuments as a great triumph for himself, and he now constantly designated himself as the conqueror of the Hittites. Once consummated, the peace was kept, and although it involved the sacrifice of Ramses' ambitions for conquest in Asia, the treaty must have been entirely satisfactory to both parties. The wives of the two contracting sovereigns, calling themselves 'the great queen of Egypt' and 'the great queen of Hatti,' exchanged friendly letters of greeting and addressed each other as 'sister.' Thirteen years later (1259 B.C.) the Hittite king himself visited Egypt to celebrate the marriage of his eldest daughter as the wife of Ramses. Bearing rich gifts in a brilliant procession, with his daughter at its head, Hattushil, accompanied by the king of Kode, appeared in Ramses' palace,

and his military escort mingled with the Egyptian troops whom they had once fought upon the Syrian plains.

The Hittite princess was given an Egyptian name, Matnefrure ('Who sees the beauty of Re'), and assumed a prominent position at court. The visit of her father was depicted on the front of Ramses' temple at Abu Simbel, with accompanying narrative inscriptions, and she was given a statue beside her royal husband in Tanis. Sound in limb and long in stride the visitors came, with rich gifts, traversing many mountains and difficult ways, warriors and regulars; and Ramses thoughtfully offered sacrifices to the god Sutekh for fair weather. Court poets celebrated the event and pictured the Hittite king as sending to the king of Kode and summoning him to join in the journey to Egypt that they might do honour to the Pharaoh. The event made a popular impression also, and a folk-tale, which was not put into writing, so far as we know, until Greek times, began with the marriage and told how afterward, at the request of her father, an image of the Theban Khonsu was sent to the land of the princess, that the god's power might drive forth the evil spirits from her afflicted sister. Throughout Ramses' long reign the treaty remained unbroken, and it is even probable that Ramses received a second daughter of Hattushil in marriage. The peace continued without interruption at least into the reign of his successor, Merneptah.

From the day of the peace compact with Hattushil, therefore, Ramses II was never called upon to enter the field again. With the Asiatic campaigns of this Pharaoh the military aggressiveness of Egypt which had been awakened under Ahmose I in the expulsion of the Hyksos was completely exhausted. Nor did it ever revive. It was with mercenary forces and under the influence of foreign blood in the royal family that sporadic attempts to recover Syria and Palestine were made in later days. Henceforward for a long time the Pharaoh's army was to be but a weapon of defence against foreign aggression: a weapon, however, which he was himself unable to control—and before which the venerable line of Re was finally to disappear.

III. THE CIVILIZATION OF THE AGE OF RAMSES II

The importance of Egyptian interests in Asia had as irresistibly drawn the centre of power on the Nile from Thebes to the Delta, as the residence of the late Roman emperors was shifted from Rome to Byzantium. The Pharaoh's constant presence there resulted in a development of the cities of the eastern Delta such

as they had never before enjoyed. Tanis became a great and flourishing city, with a splendid temple, the work of Ramses' architects. High above its massive pylons towered a monolithic granite colossus of Ramses, over ninety feet in height, weighing nine hundred tons, and visible across the level country of the surrounding Delta for many miles. The Wadi Tūmilāt, along which ran the canal from the Nile eastward to the Bitter Lakes, forming a natural approach to Egypt from Asia, was also the object of Ramses' careful attention, and he built upon it, half-way out to the Isthmus of Suez, a 'store-city,' which he called Pithom, or 'House of Atum.' At its western end he and Seti founded a city just north of Heliopolis, now known as Tell el-Yehūdīyeh. In the eastern Delta he founded a residence city, Per-Ramses, or 'House of Ramses,' which, as recent study of the evidence would indicate, we should seek on the Pelusiatic arm of the Nile, at or near Pelusium. It was certainly close to the eastern frontier, for a poet of the time singing of its beauties refers to it as being between Egypt and Syria. It was also accessible to sea-faring traffic. Per-Ramses became the seat of government and all records of state were deposited there.

As the conclusion of his long war in Asia gave him greater leisure, Ramses devoted himself to vast monumental buildings. At Thebes he spent enormous resources on the completion of his father's mortuary temple, on another beautiful sanctuary for his own mortuary service, known to all visitors at Thebes as the Ramesseum; and on a large court and pylon in enlargement of the Luxor temple. Surpassing in size all buildings of the ancient or modern world, the colossal colonnaded hall of the Karnak temple, already begun under the first Ramses, the Pharaoh's grandfather, was now completed by Ramses II. Few of the great temples of Egypt have not some chamber, hall, colonnade or pylon which bears his name, in perpetuating which the king stopped at no desecration or destruction of the ancient monuments of the country. Numberless were the monuments of his ancestors on which he placed his own name, or still worse, from which he remorselessly appropriated building materials, as if the ancient monuments of the nation were public quarries. But, in spite of these facts, his own legitimate building was on a scale quite surpassing in size and extent anything that his ancestors had ever accomplished. The buildings which he erected were filled with innumerable supplementary monuments, especially obelisks and colossal statues of himself. The latter are the greatest monolithic statues ever executed.

We have already referred to the tallest of these in the temple at

Tanis; there was another granite monolith towering over the pylons of the Ramesseum at Thebes which, although not so high, weighed something like a thousand tons. As the years passed and he celebrated jubilee after jubilee the obelisks which he erected in commemoration of these festivals rapidly rose among his temples. At Tanis alone he erected no less than fourteen, all of which are now prostrate; three at least of his obelisks are in Rome; and of the two which he erected in Luxor, one is in Paris. Notwithstanding the shift of the centre of gravity northward, the south was not neglected. In Nubia Ramses became the patron deity; no less than six new temples arose there, dedicated to the great gods of Egypt. Of his Nubian sanctuaries, the great rock temple at Abu Simbel is the finest and deservedly the goal of modern travellers in Egypt. Ramses' great building enterprises were not achieved without vast expense of resources, especially those of labour. While he was unable to draw upon Asia for captive labour as extensively as his great predecessors of the XVIIIth Dynasty, yet his building must have been largely accomplished by such means. Besides the wealth absorbed in its erection, every temple demanded a rich endowment for its maintenance, and such liberal provision for all his numerous temples must have been a serious economic problem.

Foreign intercourse, especially with Palestine and Syria, was now more intimate than ever. In the rough memoranda of a commandant's scribe, probably of the frontier fortress of Tharu (or Thel, just east of the modern Suez Canal at Kantara), we find noted the people whom he had allowed to pass: messengers with letters for the officers of the Palestinian garrisons, for the king of Tyre, and for officers with the king (Merneptah) then perhaps campaigning in Syria, besides officers bearing reports, or hurrying out to Syria to join the Pharaoh. Although there was never a continuous fortification of any length across the Isthmus of Suez, there was a line of strongholds, of which Tharu was one and Per-Ramses another, stretching well across the zone along which Egypt might be entered from Asia. This zone did not extend to the southern side of the isthmus, but was confined to the territory between Lake Timsah and the Mediterranean, whence the line of fortresses extended southward, passed the lake and bent westward into the Wadi Tūmilāt. Hence it is that Hebrew tradition depicts the escape of the Israelites across the southern half of the isthmus south of the line of defences, which might have stopped them.

The tide of commerce that ebbed and flowed through the

Isthmus of Suez was even fuller than under the XVIIIth Dynasty, while on the Mediterranean the Egyptian galleys must have whitened the sea. On the Pharaoh's table were rarities and delicacies from Cyprus, the land of the Hittites and of the Amorites, Babylonia and Naharin. Elaborately wrought chariots, weapons, whips and gold-mounted staves from the Palestinian and Syrian towns filled his magazines, while his stalls boasted fine horses of Babylon and cattle of the Hittite country. The appurtenances of a rich man's estate included a galley plying between Egypt and the Syrian coast to bring to the pampered Egyptian the luxuries of Asia; and even Seti I's mortuary temple at Abydos possessed its own sea-going vessels, given by Ramses, to convey the temple offerings from the east. The houses of the rich were filled with the most exquisite products of the Asiatic craftsman and artist; and these works strongly influenced the art of the time in Egypt. The country swarmed with Semitic and other Asiatic slaves. It is quite plausible that Ramses II, probably the builder of Pithom and Raamses, store-cities of the eastern Delta, should have been the Pharaoh who figured in the tradition of the Israelites, and that a group of their ancestors, after a friendly reception, were subjected to slave labour in the building of the two places mentioned. A letter of a frontier official, dated in the reign of Ramses II's successor, tells of passing a body of Edomite Bedouins through a fortress in the Wadi Tūmilāt, that they might pasture their herds by the pools of Pithom as the Hebrews had done in the days of Joseph. Phoenician and other alien merchants were so numerous that there was a foreign quarter in Memphis, with its temples of Baal and Astarte; and these and other Semitic gods found a place in the Egyptian pantheon. The dialects of Syria, of which Hebrew was one, lent many a Semitic word to the current language of the day, as well as select terms with which the learned scribes were fond of garnishing their writings. We find such words commonly in the XIXth Dynasty papyri long before they appear in the Hebrew writings of the Old Testament.

Already apparent under the XVIIIth Dynasty, the influence of the vast influx of Asiatic life was now profound. The royal family was not exempt from such influence; Ramses' favourite daughter was called 'Bint-Anath,' a Semitic name, which means 'Daughter of Anath' (a Syrian goddess), and one of the royal steeds was named 'Anath-herte,' 'Anath is Satisfied.' Many a foreigner of Semitic blood found favour and ultimately high station at the court or in the government. A Syrian named

Ben-'Ozen was chief herald or marshal of Merneptah's court, though he was never regent as sometimes stated. The commercial opportunities of the time brought wealth and power to such foreigners in Egypt; a Syrian sea-captain named Ben-Anath was able to secure a son of Ramses II as a husband for his daughter. In the army great careers were open to such foreigners, although the rank and file of the Pharaoh's forces were replenished from western and southern peoples rather than from Asia. In a body of five thousand troops sent by Ramses to the Wadi Hammamat for service in the quarries there, not a single native Egyptian was to be found; over four thousand of them were Sherden and Libyans and the remainder were Nubians, common in the Egyptian ranks as early as the VIth Dynasty. The dangerous tendencies inherent in such a system had already shown themselves, and were soon felt by the royal house, although powerless to make head against them. The warlike spirit which had made Egypt the first world power had endured but a few generations, and a naturally peaceful people were returning to their accustomed peaceful life; while at the very moment when this reversion to their old manner of living was taking place, the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean and the Libyan tribes offered the Pharaoh an excellent class of mercenary soldiery which under such circumstances he could not fail to utilize.

Although the empire in Asia was greatly shrunken, all Palestine and possibly some of northern Syria continued to pay tribute to the Pharaoh, while on the south the boundary was as before at Napata, below the fourth cataract. There were stately pageants when the magnificent Pharaoh, now in the prime of life, received the magnates of his empire, from the crown-prince down through all his exalted dignitaries to the mayors of the outlying towns, a brilliant procession, bringing him the tribute and imposts of his realm from the southern limits of Nubia to the Hittite frontier in Syria. The wealth thus gained still served high purposes. Art still flourished, especially in works of the sculptor and architect. Buildings and statues of colossal proportions, which still serve to make the Nile valley a veritable wonderland, were the work of the XIXth Dynasty and especially of Ramses II. To him we chiefly owe the overwhelming grandeur of the great Karnak hall, while in his mortuary temple, the Ramesseum, we have a building hardly inferior in refined beauty to the best works of the XVIIIth Dynasty. No visitor to the temple of Abu Simbel will ever forget the solemn grandeur of this lonely sanctuary looking out upon the river from the sombre cliffs. But among the host of buildings

which Ramses exacted from his architects, there were unavoidably many which were devoid of all life and freshness, or, like his addition to the Luxor temple, heavy, vulgar, and of very slovenly workmanship. All such buildings were emblazoned with gaily coloured reliefs, depicting the valiant deeds of the Pharaoh in his various wars, especially, as we have already noticed, in his desperate defence at the battle of Kadesh. This last was the most pretentious composition ever attempted by the Egyptian draughtsman.

This last incident was not only influential in graphic art; it also wrought powerfully upon the imagination of the court poets, one of whom produced a prose poem on the battle, which displays a good deal of literary skill, and is the nearest approach to the epic to be found in Egyptian literature. A copy of this composition on papyrus was made by a scribe named Pentewere (Pentaur), who was misunderstood by early students of the document to be the author of the poem. The real author is unknown, although 'Pentaur' still commonly enjoys the distinction. In manner this heroic poem strikes a new note; but it came at a period too late in the history of the nation to be the impulse toward a really great epic. The martial age and the creative spirit were past in Egypt. In the tale, however, the XIXth Dynasty really showed great fertility, combined with a spontaneous naturalism, which quite swept away all trace of the artificialities of the Middle Kingdom. Already in the Middle Kingdom there had grown up collections of artless folk-tales woven often about a historical motive, and such tales, clothed in the simple language of the people, had already in the XVIIIth Dynasty gained sufficient respectability to be put into writing. While the XVIIIth Dynasty possessed such tales as these, yet by far the larger part of our surviving manuscripts of this class date from the XIXth Dynasty and later. While much of such literature is poetic in content and spirit, it lacks poetic form. Such form, however, was not wanting, and among the songs of this period are some poems which might well find a place among a more pretentious literature. There were love-songs also, which in a land where imagination was not strong possess qualities of genuine feeling, and do not fail in their appeal to us of the modern world. Religious poems, songs and hymns are now very numerous, and some of them display distinct literary character. We shall revert to them again in discussing the religion of this age. Numerous letters from scribes and officials of the time, exercises and practice letters composed by pupils of the scribal schools, bills, temple-records and accounts—all these

serve to fill in the detail in a picture of unusual fullness and interest. See below, pp. 221 *sqq.*, 326 *sq.*

Since the overthrow of Ikhnaton and the return to the conventions of the past, the state religion had lost all vitality, and in the hands of the orthodox priests no longer possessed the creative faculty. Yet the religion of the time was making a kind of progress, or at least it was moving in a certain direction and that very rapidly. The state, always closely connected with religion, was gradually being more and more regarded as chiefly a religious institution, designed to exalt and honour the gods through its head the Pharaoh. Among other indications of this tendency the names of the temples furnish a significant hint. Sanctuaries which formerly bore names like 'Splendour of Splendours,' 'Splendid in Monuments,' 'Gift of Life,' and the like, were now designated 'Dwelling of Seti in the House of Amon,' or 'Dwelling of Ramses in the House of Ptah.' This tendency, already observable in the Middle Kingdom, was now universal, and every temple was thus designated not only as the sanctuary, but also as the *dwelling* of the ruling Pharaoh. It was an indication that what had long been a sacerdotal ideal of the state was now beginning to be practically realized: the empire was to become the domain of the gods and the Pharaoh was to give himself up to the duties of a universal high-priesthood.

Accordingly, the state was being gradually distorted to fulfil one function at the expense of all the rest, and its wealth and economic resources were thus being slowly engulfed, until its industrial processes should become but incidents in the maintenance of the gods. The temple endowments, not being subject to taxes, played an important economic role, and we have seen Seti I and Ramses II in search of new sources of revenue as the demands of the priesthoods increased. As the wealth and power of Amon in particular were augmented, his high-priest at Thebes became a more and more important political factor. We recall that he was head of the sacerdotal organization embracing all the priesthoods of the country; he thus controlled a most influential political faction. Hence it was that the high-priest of Amon under Merneptah (Ramses II's son and successor) and possibly already under Ramses himself, was able to go further and to install his son as his own successor, thus firmly entrenching his family at the head of the most powerful hierarchy in Egypt. While such a family like a royal dynasty might suffer overthrow, the precedent was a dangerous one, and it ultimately resulted in the dethronement of the Pharaohs at the hands of the priests. That event,

however, was still a century and half distant, and meantime the high-priest employed his power and influence with the Pharaoh in enforcing ever fresh demands upon his treasury until, before the close of the XIXth Dynasty, Amon had even secured certain 'gold country' in his own right. It was administered by the viceroy of Kush, who therefore assumed the additional title 'Governor of the Gold Country of Amon.' Already in his first year we find Ramses II permitting the priests of Amon to dictate the appointment of their own high-priest by an oracle of the god himself. Later in his reign the priesthood had actually usurped legal functions also, and the question of a disputed title to land was settled by an oracle from a temple statue of Ahmose I. That the judicial authorities were obliged to accept such priestly juggling as a legal verdict shows us the gradual emergence of the sacerdotal state described by Diodorus, upon which the Egyptian priests of Greek times looked back as upon a golden age. On the trend towards sacerdotalism see also p. 209.

Though the state religion was made up of formalities, the Pharaohs were not without their own ethical standards, and these were not always wholly a matter of appearances. We have witnessed the efforts of Harmhab to enforce honesty in the dealings of the government with its subjects; we have noted Thutmose III's respect for truth. In the dedicatory record of his mortuary temple at Thebes, Ramses III proclaims that he did not remove any old tombs to obtain the necessary room for the building; and he also wishes it known that he gained his exalted station without depriving any one else of the throne. On the other hand, we have also noticed the barbarous disregard of the sanctity of the monuments of his ancestors by Ramses II. The things for which the Ramessid kings prayed were not character nor the blameless life. It is material things which they desire. Ramses IV prays to Osiris, 'And thou shalt give to me health, life, long existence and a prolonged reign; endurance to my every member, sight to my eyes, hearing to my ears, pleasure to my heart daily. And thou shalt give to me to eat until I am satisfied, and thou shalt give to me to drink until I am drunk. And thou shalt establish my issue as kings forever and ever. And thou shalt grant me contentment every day, and thou shalt hear my voice in every saying, when I shall tell them to thee, and thou shalt give them to me with a loving heart. And thou shalt give to me high and plenteous Niles in order to supply thy divine offerings and to supply the divine offerings of all the gods and goddesses of South and North; in order to preserve alive the divine bulls, in order to preserve

alive the people of all thy lands, their cattle and their groves, which thy hand has made. For thou art he who has made them all and thou canst not forsake them to carry out other designs with them; for that is not right.'

It is at this time that we gain our sole glimpse into the religious beliefs of the common people. The appropriation of the temples by the state had long ago driven them from their ancient shrines. The poor man had no place amid such magnificence, nor could he offer anything worthy the attention of a god of such splendour. The old modest cult of the great gods having long since passed away, the poor man could only resort to the host of minor genii or spirits of mirth and music, the demi-gods, who, frequenting this or that local region, had interest and inclination to assist the humble in their daily cares and needs. Any object whatsoever might become the poor man's god. A man writing from Thebes commends his friend to Amon, Mut and Khonsu, the great divinities of that place, but adds also, 'to the great gate of Beki, to the eight apes which are in the forecourt,' and to two trees. In the Theban necropolis Amenhotep I and the queen Nefretete have become the favourite local divinities, and a man who accidentally thrust his hand into a hole where lay a large serpent, without being bitten, immediately erected a tablet to tell the tale and express his gratitude to Amenhotep, whose power alone had saved him. Another had in some way transgressed against a goddess who, according to popular belief, resided in a hill-top of the same necropolis, and when at last the goddess released him from the power of the disease with which she was afflicting him, he erected a similar memorial in her honour. In the same way the dead might afflict the living, and an officer who was tormented by his deceased wife wrote to her a letter of remonstrance and placed it in the hand of another dead person that it might be duly delivered to his wife in the Hereafter. Besides the local gods or demi-gods and the old kings, the foreign gods of Syria, brought in by the hosts of Asiatic slaves, appear also among those to whom the folk appeal; Baal, Kadesh, Astarte, Resheph, Anath and Sutekh are not uncommon names upon the votive tablets of the time (p. 347 *sq.*), and Sutekh, a form of Set which had wandered into Syria from Egypt and returned with the Hyksos, even became the favourite and patron of the royal city of Ramses II. Animal worship now also begins to appear both among the people and in official circles.

Although perhaps rooted in the teaching of an exclusive few heretofore, belief in an intimate and personal relation between

the worshipper and his god had now, with the lapse of centuries and by slow and gradual process, become widespread among the people. An age of personal piety and inner aspiration to God now began to dawn among the masses. It is a notable development, the earliest of its kind as yet discernible in the history of the east, or for that matter in the history of man. We are able to follow it only at Thebes, and it is not a little interesting to be able to look into the souls of the common folk who thronged the streets and markets, who tilled the fields and maintained the industries, who kept the accounts and carried on the official records, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, the men and women upon whose shoulders rested the great burdens of material life in the vast capital of the Egyptian empire during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries before Christ. A scribe in one of the treasury magazines of the Theban necropolis prays to Amon, as to him

Who cometh to the silent,
Who saveth the poor,

.

Who heareth the prayers of him who calls to him,
Who saveth a man from the haughty,
Who bringeth the Nile for him who is among them,

.

When he riseth, the people live,
Their hearts live when they see him
Who giveth breath to him who is the egg,
Who maketh the people and the birds to live,
Who supplieth the needs of the mice in their holes,
The worms and the insects likewise.

It is in such an attitude as we find revealed in this prayer that the worshipper may turn to his God as to a fountain of spiritual refreshment, saying, 'Thou sweet Well for him that thirsteth in the desert; it is closed to him who speaks, but it is open to him who is silent. When he who is silent comes, lo, he finds the well.' This attitude of silent communion, waiting upon the gracious goodness of God, was not confined to the select few, nor to the educated priestly communities. On the humblest monuments of the common people Amon is called the god, 'who cometh to the silent,' or the 'lord of the silent,' as we have above observed. It is in this final development of devotional feeling, really crowning the religious and intellectual revolution of Ikhnaton, and also forming the culmination of the doctrines of social justice emerging in the Feudal Age, that the religion of Egypt reached its noblest

period (cf. below, p. 208). The materials for the age of decadence which followed are too scanty to reveal clearly the causes of the stagnation which now ensued, a decline from which the religious life of Egypt never recovered.

In morals and in the attitude toward life the sages continued to maintain a spirit of wholesome regard for the highest practical ideals, an attitude in which we discern a distinct advance upon the teachings of the Fathers. Reputation was strictly to be guarded. 'Let every place which thou lovest be known,' says the sage; and drunkenness and dissolute living are exhibited in all their disastrous consequences for the young. To the young man the dangers of immorality are bared with naked frankness. 'Guard thee from the woman from abroad, who is not known in her city; look not on her...know her not in the flesh; (for she is) a flood great and deep, whose whirling no man knows. The woman whose husband is far away, "I am beautiful," says she to thee every day. When she has no witnesses, she stands and ensnares thee. O great crime worthy of death when one hearkens, even when it is not known abroad. (For) a man takes up every sin (after) this *one*.' As for the good things of life, they are to be regarded with philosophical reserve. It is foolish to count upon inherited wealth as a source of happiness, 'Say not, "My maternal grandfather has a house on the estate of So and So." Then when thou comest to the division (by will) with thy brother, thy portion is (only) a storage-shed.' In such things indeed there is no stability. 'So it is forever, men are naught. One is rich, another is poor....He who is rich last year, he is a vagrant this year.... The watercourse of last year, it is another place this year. Great seas become dry places, and shores become deeps.' We have here that oriental resignation to the contrasts in life which seem to have developed among all the peoples of the early east.

The records of Ramses II's reign are so largely of sacerdotal origin, and so filled with the priestly adulation of the time, with its endless reiteration of conventional flattery, that we can discern little individuality through the mass of meaningless verbiage. His superb statue in Turin is proved by his surviving body to be a faithful portrait, showing us at least the outward man as he was. In person he was tall and handsome, with features of dreamy and almost effeminate beauty, in no wise suggestive of the manly traits which he certainly possessed. For the incident at Kadesh showed him unquestionably a man of fine courage with ability to rise to a supreme crisis; while the indomitable spirit evident there is again exhibited in the tenacity with which he pushed the war

against the great Hittite empire and carried his conquests, even if not lasting, far into northern Syria. He was inordinately vain and made far more ostentatious display of his wars on his monuments than was ever done by Thutmose III. He loved ease and pleasure and gave himself up without restraint to voluptuous enjoyments. He had an enormous harem, and as the years passed his children multiplied rapidly. He left over a hundred sons and at least half as many daughters, several of whom he himself married. He thus left a family so numerous that they became a Ramessid class of nobles whom we still find over four hundred years later bearing among their titles the name Ramses, not as a patronymic, but as the designation of a class or rank. He took great pride in his enormous family and often ordered his sculptors to depict his sons and daughters in long rows upon the walls of his temples. His favourite among them was Khamwese, whom he made high-priest of Ptah at Memphis. He was a great magician, whose memory still lived in the folk-tales of Egypt a thousand years later. The sons of Ramses' youth accompanied him in his wars, and according to Diodorus one of them was in command of each of the divisions of his army.

As the Pharaoh reached the thirtieth year of his reign he celebrated his first jubilee, placing the ceremonies of the celebration in the hands of his favourite son, Khamwese. Twenty years more passed, during which Ramses celebrated a jubilee every one to three years, instituting no less than nine of these feasts, a far larger number than we are able to find in the reigns of any of his predecessors. The obelisks erected on these occasions have already claimed our notice. With his name perpetuated in vast buildings distributed at all points along the Nile from the marshes of the northern Delta to the fourth cataract, Ramses lived on in magnificence even surpassing that of Amenhotep III. His was the sunset glory of the venerable line which he represented. As the years passed the sons of his youth were taken from him and Khamwese was no longer there to conduct the celebration of the old king's jubilees. One by one they passed away until twelve were gone, and the thirteenth was the eldest and heir to the throne. Yet still the old king lived on. He had lost the vitality for aggressive rule. The Libyans and the maritime peoples allied with them, Sherden, Lycians and the Aegean races whom he had once swept from his coasts or impressed into the service of his army, now entered the western Delta with impunity. The Libyans pushed forward, gradually extending their settlements almost to the gates of Memphis and crossed the southern

apex of the Delta under the very shadow of the walls of Heliopolis.

Senile decay rendered him deaf to alarms and complaints which would have brought instant retribution upon the invaders in the days of his vigorous youth. Amid the splendours of his magnificent residence in the eastern Delta, the threatening conditions at its opposite extremity never roused him from the lethargy into which he had fallen. Finally, having ruled for sixty-seven years, and being over ninety years of age, he passed away (1225 B.C.), none too soon for the redemption of his empire. We are able to look into the withered face of the aged Pharaoh, the features not greatly changed from what he was in those last days of splendour in the city of Per-Ramses, and the resemblance to the face of the youth in the noble Turin statue is still very marked. Probably no Pharaoh ever left a more profound impression upon his age. A quarter of a century later began a line of ten kings bearing his name. One of them prayed that he might be granted a reign of sixty-seven years like that of his great ancestor, and all of them with varying success imitated his glory. He had set his stamp upon them all for a hundred and fifty years, and it was impossible to be a Pharaoh without being a Ramses.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE EGYPTIAN EMPIRE

I. MERNEPTAH AND RAMSES III: THE EMPIRE ON THE DEFENSIVE

TOWARD the close of the thirteenth century B.C., the conditions of power in the eastern Mediterranean world, in which Egypt had so long played the leading rôle, suffered profound change resulting from the first historic intrusion of hostile European forces into the arena of the Near East. The southward shift of the Hellenic peoples in the Balkan Peninsula, which had probably been going on since about the close of the third millennium B.C., had disturbed and was beginning partially to displace the Aegean population, as the Greeks gradually took possession of the regions which were to form the later Greek world. Thus driven out by the Greek migration to the Mediterranean, the leaders of the disturbed maritime communities of the northern Mediterranean, chiefly Aegeans, creeping along the coasts, sought plunder or places of permanent settlement for their dependents, and together with the Libyans on the one hand and the peoples of Asia Minor on the other, they broke in wave on wave on the borders of the Pharaoh's empire. Egypt's power in Asia, like that of the Ptolemaic kings of later times, rested essentially upon her naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. The maritime leadership of the Pharaohs thus threatened, was shaken and finally gave way. With it an indispensable support of Egyptian imperial power collapsed. Inevitably thrown on the defensive by these developments, Egypt's day of conquest and aggression had passed. If this was the effect of the *external* situation just described, it was also no less the result of the serious *internal* conditions which had arisen in the later years of Ramses II's reign. For, as we have already seen, the nation had lost its expansive power; and the impulse which had resulted from the expulsion of the Hyksos three hundred and fifty years before, was no longer felt. The spirit which had stirred the heroes of the first Asiatic conquests had now vanished. For six hundred years no serious effort to extend the borders of Egypt was made; and

for the next sixty years after the death of Ramses II we find the Pharaohs struggling merely to *preserve* the empire, which it had been the ambition of their great ancestors rather to *extend*.

At this crisis in the fortunes of Egypt, after it had been under the rule of an aged man for twenty years and much needed the vigorous hand of a young and active monarch, the enfeebled Ramses was succeeded by his thirteenth son, Merneptah, now far advanced in years. Thus one old man succeeded another on the throne. The result was what might have been expected. To check the bold incursions of the Libyans and their maritime allies on the west, nothing was done.

The death of Ramses was not followed by any disturbance in the Asiatic dominions in so far as we can see. The northern border in Syria was as far north as the upper Orontes valley, including at least part of the Amorite country in which Merneptah had a royal city bearing his name, probably inherited from his father and renamed. With the Hittite kingdom he enjoyed undisturbed peace, doubtless under the terms of the old treaty, negotiated by his father forty-six years before. Indeed, Merneptah sent shiploads of grain to the Hittites to relieve them in time of famine. By the end of his second year, however, he had reason to rue the good-will shown his father's ancient enemy. Among the allies of the Hittites at the battle of Kadesh there were already maritime peoples like the Lycians and Dardanians. In some way Merneptah discovered that the Hittites were now involved in the incursions of these people in the western Delta in alliance with the Libyans. In the year three (about 1223 B.C.) the Pharaoh found widespread revolt against him in Asia: Askalon at the very gates of Egypt, the powerful city of Gezer at the lower end of the valley of Aijalon, leading up from the sea-plain to Jerusalem; Yenoam, given by Thutmose III to Amon two hundred and sixty years before; some of the tribes of Israel and all western Syria-Palestine as far as it was controlled by the Pharaoh—all these rose against their Egyptian overlord. We have nothing but a song of triumph to tell us of the ensuing war; but it is evident that Merneptah appeared in Asia in his third year, and in spite of his advanced years carried the campaign to a successful issue. It is probable, indeed, that even the Hittites did not escape his wrath, though we cannot suppose that the aged Merneptah could have done more than plunder a border town or two. The revolting cities were severely punished, and all Palestine was again humiliated and brought completely under the yoke. Among the revolters who suffered was 'Israel,' which here makes its first appearance

in history as the name of a people. Gezer must have caused Merneptah some trouble and perhaps withstood a siege; in any case he thereafter styled himself in his titulary 'Binder of Gezer,' as if its subjugation were a notable achievement. Such a siege would explain why Merneptah was unable to move against the invaders of the western Delta until his fifth year, as the investment of such a stronghold as Gezer might have occupied him another year.

The chronic situation in the western Delta, which was always overrun by Libyan intruders whenever the central government weakened or relaxed its vigilance, had now become very serious. Hordes of Tehenu-Libyans were pushing farther into the Delta from their settlements along the northern coast of Africa west of Egypt. It is possible that some of their vanguard had even reached the canal of Heliopolis. Little is known of the Libyans at this time. Immediately upon the Egyptian border seems to have been the territory of the Tehenu; farther west came the tribes known to the Egyptians as Lebu or Rebu, the Libyans of the Greeks, by which name also the Egyptians designated these western peoples as a whole. On the extreme west, and extending far into then unknown regions, lived the Meshwesh, or Maxyes, of Herodotus. They were all doubtless the ancestors of the Berber tribes of north Africa. They were far from being totally uncivilized barbarians, but were skilled in war, well armed and capable of serious enterprises against the Pharaoh. Just at this time they were rapidly consolidating, and under good leadership gave promise of becoming an aggressive and formidable state, with its frontier not ten days' march from the Pharaoh's residence in the eastern Delta. The whole western Delta was strongly tintured with Libyan blood, and Libyan families were now constantly crossing the western border of the Delta as far as the 'great river' as the western or Canopic mouth of the Nile was called. Others had penetrated to the two northern oases which lie southwest of the Fayyum. 'They spend their time going about the land fighting to fill their bellies daily,' says Merneptah's record, 'they come to the land of Egypt to seek the necessities of their mouths.'

Emboldened by their long immunity, the Libyans assumed an organized offensive, and what had been but a scattered immigration now became a compact invasion. Meryey, king of the Libyans, forced the Tehenu to join him and, supported by roving bands of maritime adventurers from the coast, he invaded Egypt. He brought his wife and children with him, as did also his allies, and the movement was clearly an immigration as well

as an invasion. Judging from the numbers who were afterward slain or captured, the Libyan king must have commanded at least some twenty thousand men or more. The allies were the now familiar Sherden (see above, p. 96); the Shekelesh (possibly the Sikel natives of Sicily, or of Sagalassus); Ekwesh (probably Achaeans); the Lycians, who had preyed on Egypt since the days of Amenhotep III; and the Teresh (supposed by some to be Tyrsenians or Etruscans)¹. It is with these wandering marauders that the peoples of Europe emerged for the first time upon the arena of history with the older oriental peoples, although we have seen them in their material documents since the Middle Kingdom.

When the news of the danger reached him late in March of his fifth year, Merneptah, fully aroused to the situation, was fortifying Heliopolis and Memphis. Instantly summoning his officials, he ordered them to muster the troops and have the army ready to move in fourteen days. The aged king had a reassuring dream in which Ptah appeared in gigantic stature beside him and extended him a sword, telling him to banish all fear. By the middle of April the Egyptian force was in the western Delta, and on the evening of the same day came within striking distance of the enemy. Somewhere on the main road leading westward out of the Delta into the Libyan country, a few miles inward from the frontier fort and station guarding the road at the point where it entered the Delta, was a place called Perire. In its vicinity, among the opulent vineyards of the region, there was a château of the Pharaoh, and thence eastward extended the broad prospect of nodding grain fields where the rich Delta harvest was now fast ripening for the sickle. Upon such a prospect of smiling plenty the barbarian host looked down as they pushed past the western frontier forts. By the Pharaoh's Perire château, on the morning of April 15, 1221 B.C., battle was joined. The contest had lasted six hours when the Egyptian archers drove the allies from the field with immense loss. In accordance with the use of cavalry at this point in a battle in modern times, Merneptah now immediately threw in his chariotry in pursuit of the flying enemy, who were harried and decimated till they reached the 'Mount of the Horns of the Earth,' as the Egyptians called the edge of the plateau on the west of the Delta into which they escaped. King Meryey had fled from the field as soon as he saw the action going against him. He made good his escape, but all his household furniture and

¹ In place of these merely conventional transcriptions of the (unvocalized) Egyptian names, there are others influenced by the identifications proposed for them; see below, p. 173, n. 1, and pp. 275 *seq.*

his family fell into the hands of the Egyptians. The energetic pursuit resulted in a great slaughter and many prisoners. No less than nine thousand of the invaders fell, of whom at least one-third were among the maritime allies of the Libyans; and probably as many more were taken prisoner. Among the dead were six sons of the Libyan king. When the camp had been thoroughly looted its leathern tents were fired and the whole went up in smoke and flame. The booty was enormous: some nine thousand copper swords, and of weapons of all sorts and similar equipment no less than over one hundred and twenty thousand pieces. Besides these there were the fine weapons and vessels in precious metal taken from the camp of the Libyan king's household and chiefs, comprising over three thousand pieces.

Returning in triumph, the army then marched to the royal residence bearing, laden upon asses, the hands and other trophies cut from the bodies of the slain. The booty and the trophies were brought beneath the palace balcony, where the king inspected them and showed himself to the rejoicing multitude. He then assembled the nobles in the great hall of the palace where he harangued them. What was more important, there now came to him a letter from the commandant of one of the fortresses on the frontier of the western Delta, stating that the Libyan king had escaped past the Egyptian cordon in the darkness of the night, and adding information to the effect that the Libyans had repudiated and dethroned their discomfited king and chosen another in his place who was hostile to him and would fight him. It was evident therefore that the aggressive party in Libya had fallen and that no further trouble from that quarter, at least during the reign of Merneptah, need be apprehended.

The intense relief evident in the exuberant triumph which followed this deliverance is significant of Egypt's completely altered situation. No longer launching armies on distant campaigns of conquest, the Pharaohs were now engaged in a desperate struggle to maintain the home frontiers of the ancient kingdom. The constant plundering at the hands of Libyan hordes, which the people of the western Delta had endured for nearly a generation, was now ended, and an intolerable situation was relieved. The people sang: 'Great joy has come in Egypt, rejoicing comes forth from the towns of Tomeri (Egypt).... Sit happily down and talk or walk far out upon the way for there is no fear in the heart of the people. The strongholds are left to themselves, the wells are opened again. The messengers skirt the battlements of the walls, shaded from the sun, until their watchmen wake. The

soldiers lie sleeping and the border-scouts are in the field (or not) as they desire. The herds of the field are left as cattle sent forth without a herdman, crossing at will the fullness of the stream. There is no uplifting of a shout in the night: "Stop! Behold one comes, one comes with the speech of strangers!" One comes and goes with singing, and there is no lamentation of mourning people. The towns are settled again anew; and as for one that ploweth his harvest, he shall eat of it. Re has turned himself to Egypt; he was born destined to be her protector, even the king Merneptah.'

The kings are overthrown, saying, 'Salām!'
Not one holds up his head among the Nine Nations of the Bow.
Wasted is Tehenu,
The Hittite land is pacified,
Plundered is 'the Canaan,' with every evil,
Carried off is Askalon,
Seized upon is Gezer,
Yenoam is made as a thing not existing.
Israel is desolated, her seed is not,
Palestine has become a (defenceless) widow for Egypt.
All lands are united, they are pacified;
Every one that is turbulent is bound by king Merneptah.

Merneptah reigned at least five years longer, apparently enjoying profound peace in the north. He strengthened his Asiatic frontier with a fortress bearing his name, and in the south he quelled a rebellion in Nubia. The commonly accepted statement that toward the end of his reign a Syrian at court gained control of Merneptah and became regent is entirely without foundation and due to misunderstanding of the titles of Ben-'Ozen, the Syrian marshal of his court, to whom we have already referred. The long reign of Ramses II, with its prodigality in buildings, left Merneptah little means to gratify his own desires in this respect. Moreover, his days were numbered, and there was not time to hew from the quarries and transport the materials for such a temple as it had now become customary for each Pharaoh to erect at Thebes for his own mortuary service. Under these circumstances, Merneptah had no hesitation in resorting to the most brutal destruction of the monuments of his ancestors. To obtain materials for his mortuary temple he made a quarry of the noble sanctuary of Amenhotep III on the western plain, barbarously tore down its walls and split up its superb statues to serve as blocks in his own building. Among other things thus appropriated was a magnificent black granite stela over ten feet high containing a record of the buildings of Amenhotep III. Merneptah's scribes

cut upon the back a hymn of victory over the Libyans, of which we have quoted the conclusion above, and with its face to the wall, he then erected it in his new building, where Petrie found it. It has become notable because it contains the earliest known reference to Israel (p. 320). Merneptah's desecration of the great works of the earlier Pharaohs did not even spare those of his own father who, it will be remembered, had set him a notorious example in this respect. Ramses II had the effrontery, after a lifetime of such vandalism, to record in his Abydos temple a long appeal to his descendants to respect his foundations and his monuments; but not even his own son showed them the respect which he craved. We find Merneptah's name constantly on the monuments of his father.

Merneptah passed away (1215 B.C.) after a reign of at least ten years and was buried at Thebes in the valley with his ancestors. His body has been found there—a discovery somewhat disconcerting to those who held that, as the Pharaoh of the Israelite exodus, he must have been drowned in the Red Sea (see p. 356, n. 2). However much we may despise him for his desecration and shameful destruction of the greatest works of his ancestors, it must be admitted at the same time that, at an advanced age, when such responsibility must have sat heavily, he manfully met a grave crisis in the history of his country, which might have thrown it into the hands of a foreign dynasty.

The death of Merneptah was the beginning of a conflict for the throne which lasted for many years. The laxity which had accompanied the long-continued rule of two old men gave ample opportunity for intrigue, conspiracy and the machinations of rival factions. Two pretenders were at first successful: Amenmeses and Merneptah-Siptah. The former was but an ephemeral usurper, who through some collateral line of the royal house perhaps possessed a distant claim to the throne. He was hostile to the memory of Merneptah; and his successor, Merneptah-Siptah, who quickly supplanted him, took possession of his monuments in turn, and destroyed his tomb in the western valley of Thebes. Nubia was now a fruitful source of hostility to the royal house. Like the Roman provinces in the days of that empire, Nubia offered a field, at a safe distance from the seat of power, where a sentiment against the ruling house and in favour of some pretender might be secretly encouraged without great danger of detection. It was perhaps in Nubia that Siptah gained the ascendancy. However this may be, we find him in his first year installing his viceroy there in person, and sending one of his

adherents about distributing rewards there. By such methods and by marrying Tewosret, probably a princess of the old Pharaonic line, he succeeded in maintaining himself for at least six years, during which the tribute from Nubia seems to have been regularly delivered, and the customary intercourse with the Syrian provinces maintained.

The viceroy whom he appointed in Nubia was one Seti, who was now also, as already observed, 'Governor of the Gold Country of Amon.' This brought him into intimate relations with the powerful priesthood of Amon at Thebes, and it is not impossible that he improved the opportunity of this intercourse and of his influential position to do what Siptah had himself done in Nubia. In any case, when Siptah disappeared, a Seti succeeded him as second of that name. He was later regarded as the sole legitimate king of the three who followed Merneptah. He seems to have ruled with some success, for he built a small temple at Karnak and another at Eshmunēn-Hermopolis. He took possession of the tomb of Siptah and his queen, Tewosret, although he was afterward able to excavate one of his own. But his lease of power was brief; the long uncurbed nobility, the hosts of mercenaries in the armies, the powerful priesthoods, the numerous foreigners in positions of rank at court, ambitious pretenders and their adherents—all these aggressive and conflicting influences demanded for their control a strong hand and unusual qualities of statesmanship in the ruler. These qualities Seti II did not possess, and he fell a victim to conditions of almost insuperable difficulty.

With the fall of Seti II, complete anarchy ensued. The whole country fell into the hands of the local nobles, chiefs and rulers of towns, and remained so for many years. The nation must have been well on toward dissolution into the petty kingdoms and principalities out of which it was consolidated at the dawn of history. Then came famine, with all the misery which the Arab historians later depict in their annals of similar periods under the Mameluk sultans in Egypt. Indeed, the record of this period left us by Ramses III in the great Papyrus Harris, in spite of its brevity, reads like a chapter from the rule of some Mameluk sultan of the fourteenth century. Profiting by the helplessness of the people and the preoccupation of the native rulers, one of those Syrians, who had held an official position at the court, seized the crown or at least the power, and ruled in tyranny and violence. 'He set the whole land tributary before him together; he united his companions and plundered their possessions. They made the

gods like men and no offerings were presented in the temples.' Property-rights were therefore no longer respected and even the revenues of the temples were diverted.

As in the later years of Ramses II the Libyans were not long in perceiving the helplessness of Egypt. Immigration across the western frontier of the Delta began again; plundering bands wandered among the towns from the vicinity of Memphis to the Mediterranean, or took possession of the fields and settled on both shores of the Canopic branch. At this juncture, about 1200 B.C., there arose one Setnakht, a strong man of uncertain origin, but probably a descendant of the old line of Seti I and Ramses II; and although the land was beset with foes within and without, he possessed the qualities of organization and the statesmanship first to make good his claims against the innumerable local aspirants to the crown; and having subdued these, to restore power and organize the almost vanished state of the old Pharaohs.

We shall readily understand that Setnakht's arduous achievement left him little time for monuments which might have perpetuated his memory. Indeed, he could not even find opportunity to excavate for himself a tomb at Thebes; but seized that of Siptah and his queen, Tewosret, which had already been appropriated, but eventually not used, by Seti II. His reign must have been brief, for his highest date is his first year, scratched on the back of a leaf of papyrus by a scribe in trying his pen. Before he died (1198 B.C.) he named as his successor his son, Ramses, the third of the name, who had already been of assistance to him in the government.

Although the old line was evidently already interrupted after Merneptah, Manetho begins a new dynasty, the XXth, with the Ramessid line, now headed by Ramses III. The new Pharaoh inherited a situation precisely like that which confronted Merneptah at his accession; but being a young and vigorous man, he was better able successfully to cope with it. He immediately perfected the organization for military service, dividing all the people into classes successively liable for such service. Since the native contingent was constantly shifting, as class after class passed through the army, the Pharaoh came more and more to depend upon the mercenaries as the permanent element in his army. A large proportion of the standing army, therefore, consisted of Sherden mercenaries as in the days of Ramses II, while a contingent of the Kehek, a Libyan tribe, was also in the ranks. In the west more serious developments had taken place since Merneptah's Libyan war. The restless and turbulent peoples of

the northern Mediterranean, whom the Egyptians designated 'the Peoples of the Sea,' and whom we know as the Aegeans, were showing themselves in ever-increasing numbers in the south. Among these, two in particular whom we have not met before, the Thekel and the Peleset, were prominently aggressive¹. The Peleset (Pulesati), better known as the Philistines of Hebrew history, were no doubt one of the early tribes of Crete, but the identity of the Thekel is much more uncertain (p. 283 n.). They were accompanied by contingents of Denyen (possibly Danaï), Sherden, Weshesh and Shekelesh. Moving gradually southward in Syria, some of these immigrants had advanced perhaps as far as the upper waters of the Orontes and the kingdom of Amor; while the more venturesome of their ships were coasting along the Delta and stealing into the mouths of the rivers on plundering expeditions. They readily fell in with the plans of the Libyan leaders to invade and plunder the rich and fertile Delta. By land and water they advanced into the western Delta where Ramses promptly met them and gave them battle near a town called 'Usermare-Meriamon (Ramses III) is chastiser of Temeh (Libya).' This was in 1194 B.C. Their ships were destroyed or captured and their army beaten back with enormous loss. Over twelve thousand five hundred were slain upon the field and at least a thousand captives were taken. Of the killed a large proportion were from the ranks of the sea-rovers. There was the usual triumph at the royal residence, when the king viewed the captives and the trophies from the balcony of the palace, while his nobles rejoiced below. Amon, who had granted the great victory, did not fail to receive his accustomed sacrifice of living victims, and all Egypt rejoiced in restored security, such that, as Ramses boasted, a woman might walk abroad as far as she wished with her veil raised without fear of molestation. To strengthen his frontier against the Libyans Ramses now built a town and stronghold named after himself upon the western road where it left the Delta and passed westward into the desert plateau. It stood upon an elevated point known as the 'Mount of the Horns of the Earth,' already mentioned by Merneptah in his war-records.

The advanced galleys and the land-forces of the northern

¹ The initial consonant of Thekel is by some authorities represented by *z*; and, instead of employing *e*'s to make the consonants pronounceable, other scholars conjecturally vocalize differently. Thus Thekel appears otherwise as Zakkal or Zakaray, and Peleset as Pulesati (or the like); see p. 167, n. 1. Certainty is at present unattainable. See further, chap. XII.

maritime peoples which supported the Libyans against Ramses III in the year five were but the premonitory skirmish line of a far more serious advance, to which we have already adverted. It was now in full motion southward through Syria. Its hosts were approaching both *by land*, with their families in curious, heavy, two-wheeled ox-carts, and *by sea* in a numerous fleet that skirted the Syrian coast. Well armed and skilled in warfare as the invaders were, the Syrian city-states were unable to withstand their onset. They overran all the Hittite country of northern Syria as far as Carchemish on the Euphrates, past Arvad on the Phœnician coast, and up the Orontes valley to the kingdom of Amor, which they devastated. The Syrian dominions of the Hittites must have been lost and the Hittite power in Syria completely broken. The fleet visited Alasa, and nowhere was an effective resistance offered them. 'They came with fire, prepared before them, forward to Egypt. Their main support was Peleset, Thekel, Shekesh, Denyen and Weshesh. These lands were united and they laid their hands upon the land as far as the circle of the earth.' 'The countries, which came from their isles in the midst of the sea, they advanced to Egypt, their hearts relying upon their arms.' In Amor they established a central camp and apparently halted for a time. Like a rising tide from the north, this great migration was threatening to overwhelm the Egyptian empire. We have seen its outermost waves breaking on the shores of the Delta—the heralds of the most formidable danger that had ever confronted the empire of the Pharaohs.

With the greatest energy Ramses III fortified his Syrian frontier and rapidly gathered a fleet, which he distributed in the northern harbours. From his palace balcony he personally superintended the equipment of the infantry, and when all was in readiness he set out for Syria to lead the campaign himself. Where the land-battle took place we are unable to determine, but as the northerners had advanced to Amor, it was at most not farther north than that region. We learn nothing from the king's records concerning it beyond vague and general statements of the defeat of the enemy, although in his reliefs we see his Sherden mercenaries breaking through the scattered lines of the enemy and plundering their ox-carts bearing their women and children and belongings. As there were Sherden among the invaders, the mercenaries were thus called upon to fight their own countrymen. The Pharaoh was also able to reach the scene of the naval battle, probably in one of the northern harbours on the coast of Phœnicia, early enough to participate in the action from the neighbouring

shore (see p. 283 n.). He had manned his fleet with masses of the dreaded Egyptian archers, whose archery volleys were so effective that the ranks of the heavy-armed northerners were completely decimated before they could approach within boarding distance. These volleys of arrows from the Egyptian fleet were augmented by those of Egyptian archers whom Ramses stationed along the shore, he himself personally drawing his bow against the hostile fleet. As the Egyptians then advanced to board, the enemy's ships were thrown into confusion. 'Capsized and perishing in their places, their hearts are taken, their souls fly away, and their weapons are cast out upon the sea. His arrows pierce whomsoever he will among them, and he who is hit falls into the water.' 'They were dragged, overturned and laid low upon the beach; slain and made heaps from stern to bow of their galleys, while all their things were cast upon the waters, for a remembrance of Egypt.' Those who escaped the fleet and swam ashore were captured by the waiting Egyptians on the beach. In these two engagements the Pharaoh decisively broke the power of the northern invasion, and his suzerainty, at least as far north as Amor, could not be questioned by the invaders. To be sure they continued to arrive in Syria, but the double victory of Ramses III made these new settlers and their new settlements vassals of Egypt, paying tribute into the treasury of the Pharaoh.

The Egyptian empire in Asia had again been saved and Ramses returned to his Delta residence to enjoy a well-earned triumph. The respite which his victory brought him, however, was very short; for another migration of the peoples in the far west caused an overflow which again threatened the Delta. The Meshwesh, a tribe living behind the Libyans, that is, on the west of them, were the cause of the trouble. The first victory over the Libyans in the year five was quite enough to quench any further desire on their part to repeat their attempt upon the Delta. But unfortunately the Meshwesh invaded the Libyan country and laid it waste, thus forcing the unfortunate Libyans into an alliance against Egypt. The leader of the movement was Meshesher, son of Keper, king of the Meshwesh, whose firm purpose was to migrate and settle in the Delta. 'The hostile foe had taken counsel again to spend their lives in the confines of Egypt, that they might take the hills and plains as their own districts.' "We will settle in Egypt," so spoke they with one accord, and they continuously entered the boundaries of Egypt.' By the twelfth month in the king's eleventh year they had begun the invasion, entering along the western road as in the time of Merneptah and

investing the fortress of Hatsho, some eleven miles from the edge of the desert plateau. Ramses attacked them under the walls of Hatsho, from the ramparts of which the Egyptian garrison poured volleys of arrows into the ranks of the Meshwesh, already discomfited by the Pharaoh's onset. The invaders were thus thrown into a disordered rout and received the volleys of another neighbouring stronghold as they fled. Ramses pressed the pursuit for eleven miles along the western road to the margin of the plateau, thus fairly driving the invaders out of the country. Meshesher, the chief of the Meshwesh, was slain and his father Keper was captured; two thousand one hundred and seventy-five of their followers fell, while two hundred and fifty-two, of whom over a fourth were females, were taken captive.

Ramses tells of the disposition which he made of these captives: 'I settled their leaders in strongholds in my name. I gave to them captains of archers and chief men of the tribes, branded and made into slaves, impressed with my name; their wives and their children likewise.' Nearly a thousand of the Meshwesh were assigned to the care of a temple-herd called 'Ramses III is the Conqueror of the Meshwesh.' Similarly he established in celebration of his victory an annual feast which he called in his temple calendar, 'Slaying of the Meshwesh'; and he assumed in his elaborate titulary after his name the epithets, 'Protector of Egypt, Guardian of the Countries, Conqueror of the Meshwesh, Spoiler of the Land of Temeh.' The western tribes had thus been hurled back from the borders of the Delta for the third successive time, and Ramses had no occasion to apprehend any further aggressions from that quarter. The expansive power of the Libyan peoples, although by no means exhausted, now no longer appeared in united national action; but, as they had done from prehistoric times, and like the northern barbarians who crossed the frontiers of the Roman empire, they continued to sift gradually into the Delta in scattered and desultory migration, not regarded by the Pharaoh as a source of danger.

Ramses soon found it necessary to appear again in Syria with his army. The limits and the course of the campaign are but obscurely hinted at in the meagre records now surviving. He stormed at least five strong cities, one of which was in Amor; another depicted in his reliefs as surrounded by water was perhaps Kadesh; a third, rising upon a hill, cannot be identified; and both of the remaining two, one of which was called Ereth, were defended by Hittites. He probably did not penetrate far into the Hittite territory, although its cities were rapidly falling away

from the Hittite king and much weakened by the attacks of the sea-peoples. It was the last hostile passage between the Pharaoh and the Hittites; both empires were swiftly declining to their fall, and in the annals of Egypt we never again hear of the Hittites in Syria. Ramses places in his lists of conquered regions the cities of northern Syria to the Euphrates, including all that the empire had ever ruled in its greatest days. These lists however are largely copied from those of his great predecessors, and we can place no confidence in them. He now organized the Asiatic possessions of Egypt as stably as possible, the boundary very evidently not being any farther north than that of Merneptah, that is, just including the Amorite kingdom on the upper Orontes. To ensure the necessary stability he built new fortresses wherever advisable in Syria and Palestine. Somewhere in Syria he also erected a temple of Amon, containing a great image of the state god, before which the Asiatic dynasts were obliged to declare their fealty to Ramses by depositing their tribute in its presence every year. Communication with Syria was facilitated by the excavation of a great well in the desert of Ayan, east of the Delta, supplementing the watering-stations there established by Seti I. Only a revolt of the Bedouins of Seir interrupted the peaceful government of the Pharaoh in Asia from this time forth.

II. THE INTERNAL DECAY OF THE EMPIRE

The suppression of occasional disorders in Nubia caused no disturbance of the profound peace which now settled down upon the empire. Ramses himself depicts it thus: 'I made the woman of Egypt to go with uncovered ears to the place she desired, for no stranger, nor any one upon the road molested her. I made the infantry and chariotry to dwell at home in my time; the Sherden and the Kehek (mercenaries) were in their towns lying the length of their backs; they had no fear, for there was no enemy from Kush, nor foe from Syria. Their bows and their weapons reposed in their magazines, while they were satisfied and drunk with joy. Their wives were with them, their children at their side; they looked not behind them, but their hearts were confident, for I was with them as the defence and protection of their limbs. I sustained alive the whole land, whether foreigners, common folk, citizens or people male or female. I took a man out of his misfortune and I gave him breath. I rescued him from the oppressor who was of more account than he. I set each man in his security in their towns; I sustained alive others in the hall of petition. I

settled the land in the place where it was laid waste. The land was well satisfied in my reign.' The chief function of an oriental despotism, the collection of tribute and taxes, proceeded with the greatest regularity. 'I taxed them for their impost every year,' says Ramses III, 'every town by its name gathered together bearing their tribute.'

As in the great days of the empire, intercourse and commerce with the outside world were now fostered by the Pharaohs. The temples of Amon, Re and Ptah had each its own fleet upon the Mediterranean or the Red Sea, transporting to the god's treasury the products of Phoenicia, Syria and Punt. Ramses exploited the copper mines of Atika, a region somewhere in the Peninsula of Sinai, sending a special expedition thither in galleys from some Red Sea port. They returned with great quantities of the metal which the Pharaoh had displayed under the palace balcony that all the people might see it. To the malachite workings of the peninsula he likewise sent his messengers, who brought back plentiful returns of the costly mineral for the king's splendid gifts to the gods. A more important expedition consisting of a fleet of large ships was sent on the long voyage to Punt. It would seem that the canal from the Nile through the Wadi Tumulât to the Red Sea was now stopped up and in disuse, for Ramses' ships, after a successful voyage, returned to some harbour opposite Coptos, where the entire cargo of the fleet was disembarked, loaded on donkeys and brought overland to Coptos. Here it was re-embarked upon the river and floated down stream to Per-Ramses, the royal residence in the eastern Delta. Navigation was now perhaps on a larger and more elaborate scale even than under the great Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Ramses tells of a sacred barge of Amon at Thebes, which was two hundred and twenty-four feet long, built in his yards, of enormous timbers of cedar of Lebanon.

Works of public utility and improvement were also included in the Pharaoh's enterprises. Throughout the kingdom, and especially in Thebes and the royal residence, he planted numerous trees, which under a sky so prevalingly cloudless as that of Egypt, offered the people grateful shade in a land devoid of natural forests. He also resumed building, which had been at a standstill since the death of Ramses II. On the western plain of Thebes, at the point now called Medinet Habu, he built a large and splendid temple to Amon which he began early in his reign. As the temple was extended and enlarged from rear to front, the annals of his campaigns found place on the walls through successive years

following the growth of the building, until the whole edifice became a vast record of the king's achievements in war which the modern visitor may read, tracing it from year to year as he passes from the earliest halls in the rear to the latest courts and pylon at the front. Here he may see the hordes of the north in battle with Ramses' Sherden mercenaries, who break through and plunder the heavy ox-carts of the invaders; and here the first naval battle on salt-water, of which we know anything, is depicted. In these reliefs we may study the armour, clothing, weapons, war-ships and equipment of these northern peoples with whose advent Europe for the first time emerges upon the stage of the early world.

Before the temple there was a sacred lake with an elaborate garden, extensive out-buildings and magazines, a palace of the king with massive stone towers in connection with the temple-structure, and a wall around the whole forming a great complex which dominated the whole southern end of the western plain of Thebes, whence from the summit of its tall pylons one might look northward along the stately line of mortuary temples, built by the emperors. It thus formed, as it still does, the southern terminus and the last of that imposing array of buildings, and suggests to the thoughtful visitor the end of the long line of imperial Pharaohs, of whom Ramses III was indeed the last. Other buildings of his have for the most part perished. A temple of Amon at Karnak which Ramses, quite sensible of the hopelessness of any attempt to rival the vast Karnak halls, limited to very modest proportions, was placed awkwardly enough across the axis of the main temple there. In the residence city he laid out a magnificent quarter for Amon: 'it was furnished with large gardens and places for walking about, with all sorts of date-groves bearing their fruits, and a sacred avenue brightened with the flowers of every land.' The quarter possessed nearly eight thousand slaves for its service. He also erected in the city a temple of Sutekh in the *temenos* of the temple of Ramses II. The art displayed by these buildings, in so far as they have survived, is clearly in a decadent stage. The lines are heavy and indolent, the colonnades have none of the old time soaring vigour, springing from the pavement and carrying the beholder's eyes involuntarily aloft; but they visibly labour under the burden imposed upon them and clearly express the sluggish spirit of the decadent architect who designed them. The work also is careless and slovenly in execution. The reliefs which cover the vast surfaces of the Medinet Habu temple are with few exceptions but weak

imitations of the fine sculptures of Seti I at Karnak, badly drawn and executed without feeling. Only here and there do we find a flash of the old time power, as in the representation of Ramses hunting the wild bull on the walls of this same temple, a relief which, in spite of some bad faults in the drawing, is a composition of much strength and feeling, with a notable sense of landscape.

The imitation so evident in the art of the time of Ramses III is characteristic of the time in all respects. The records of the reign are but weak repetitions of the earlier royal encomiums, embellished with figures so extremely far-fetched as to be often unintelligible. Taking up any given war, one finds that after working through difficult inscriptions covering several thousand square feet of wall surface at Medinet Habu, the net result is but a meagre and bald account of a great campaign the facts of which are scattered here and there and buried so deeply beneath scores of meaningless conventional phrases that they can be discovered only with the greatest industry. The inspiring figure of a young and active Pharaoh hurrying his armies from frontier to frontier of his empire and repeatedly hurling back the most formidable invasions Egypt had ever suffered, awoke no response in the conventional soul of the priestly scribe, whose lot it was to write the record of these things for the temple wall. He possessed only the worn and long-spent currency of the older dynasties from which he drew hymns, songs and lists to be furbished up and made to do service again in perpetuating the glory of a really able and heroic ruler. Perhaps we should not complain of the scribe, for the king himself considered it his highest purpose to restore and reproduce the times of Ramses II. His own name was made up of the first half of the throne-name of Ramses II and the second half of his personal name; he named his children and his horses after those of Ramses II, and like him, he was followed on his campaigns by a tame lion which trotted beside his chariot on the march.

All immediate danger from without had now apparently disappeared, but the nation was slowly declining as a result of decay from within. While Ramses III had shown himself fully able to cope with the assaults from the outside, he was entirely unable to offer any effective opposition to the prevailing tendencies of the time within the state. This was especially evident in his attitude toward the religious conditions inherited from the XVIIIth Dynasty, but especially noticeable in the XIXth. Setnakht, his father, gained the throne by conciliating the priesthoods, as so many of his successful predecessors had done. We are unable to

discern that Ramses III made any effort to shake off the priestly influences with which the crown was thus encumbered. The temples were fast becoming a grave political and economic menace. In the face of this fact Ramses continued the policy of his ancestors, and with the most lavish liberality poured the wealth of the royal house into the sacred coffers. He himself says: 'I did mighty deeds and benefactions, a numerous multitude, for the gods and goddesses of South and North. I wrought upon their images in the gold-houses, I built that which had fallen to ruin in their temples. I made houses and temples in their courts; I planted for them groves; I dug for them lakes; I founded for them divine offerings of barley and wheat, wine, incense, fruit, cattle and fowl; I built the (chapels called) "Shadows of Re" for their districts, abiding, with divine offerings for every day.' He is here speaking of the smaller temples of the country, while for the three great gods of the land, Amon, Re and Ptah, he did vastly more.

The opulent splendour with which the rituals of these gods were daily observed beggars description. 'I made for thee,' says Ramses to Amon, 'a great sacrificial tablet of silver in hammered work, mounted with fine gold, the inlay figures being of Ketem-gold, bearing statues of the king of gold in hammered work, even an offering tablet bearing thy divine offerings, offered before thee. I made for thee a great vase-stand for thy forecourt, mounted with fine gold, with inlay of stone; its vases were of gold, containing wine and beer in order to present them to thee every morning....I made for thee great tablets of gold, in beaten work, engraved with the great name of thy majesty, bearing my prayers. I made for thee other tablets of silver, in beaten work, engraved with the great name of thy majesty, with the decrees of thy house.' All that the god used was of the same richness; Ramses says of his sacred barge: 'I hewed for thee thy august ship "Userhet," of one hundred and thirty cubits [nearly two hundred and twenty-four feet long] upon the river, of great cedars of the royal domain of remarkable size, overlaid with fine gold to the water line, like a barque of the Sun, when he comes from the east, and every one lives at the sight of him. A great shrine was in the midst of it, of fine gold, with inlay of every costly stone like a palace; ram's heads of gold from front to rear, fitted with uraeus-serpents wearing crowns.' In making the great temple-balances for weighing the offerings to Re at Heliopolis nearly two hundred and twelve pounds of gold and four hundred and sixty-one pounds of silver were consumed. The reader may

peruse pages of such descriptions in the great Papyrus Harris, of which we shall later give some account. Such magnificence, while it might frequently be due to incidental gifts of the king, must nevertheless be supported by an enormous income, derived from a vast fortune in lands, slaves and revenues. Thus, to the god Khnum at Elephantine, Ramses confirmed the possession of both sides of the river from that city to Takompso, a strip over seventy miles in length, known to the Greeks as the 'Dodekaschoinos,' or Twelve Schoeni (roods).

The records of Ramses III, for the first and only time in the course of Egyptian history, enable us to determine the total amount of property owned and controlled by the temples. An inventory in the Papyrus Harris covering almost all the temples of the country shows that they possessed over one hundred and seven thousand slaves; that is, one person in every fifty to eighty of the population was temple property. The first figure is the more probable, so that in all likelihood one person in every fifty was a slave of some temple. The temples thus owned two per cent. of the population. In lands we find the sacred endowments amounting to nearly three-quarters of a million acres, that is, nearly one-seventh, or over fourteen-and-a-half per cent. of the cultivable land of the country; and as some of the smaller temples, like that of Khnum just mentioned, are omitted in the inventory, it is safe to say that the total holdings of the temples amounted to fifteen per cent. of the available land of the country. These are the only items in the temple-estates which can be safely compared with the total national wealth and resources; but they by no means complete the list of property held by the temples. They owned nearly half-a-million head of large and small cattle; their combined fleets numbered eighty-eight vessels, some fifty-three workshops and shipyards consumed a portion of the raw materials, which they received as income; while in Syria, Kush and Egypt they owned in all one hundred and sixty-nine towns. In a land of less than ten thousand square miles and some five or six million inhabitants, all this vast property was entirely exempt from taxation; and this fact made the wealth of the priesthoods an economic menace.

This unhealthy situation was aggravated by the fact that no proper proportion had been observed in the distribution of gifts to the gods. The lion's share of them had fallen to the lot of Amon, whose insatiable priesthood had so gained the ascendancy that their claims on the royal treasury far exceeded those of all other temples put together. Besides the great group of temples at

Thebes, the god possessed numerous other sanctuaries, chapels and statues, with their endowments scattered throughout the land. He had a temple in Syria, as we have already noticed, and a new one in Nubia, besides those built there by Ramses II. In his twelfth year, after the victorious conclusion of all his wars, the finally-completed temple which he had erected for Amon at Medinet Habu (Thebes) was inaugurated with a new and elaborate calendar of feasts, the record of which filled all one wall of the temple for almost its entire length. The feast of Opet, the greatest of Amon's feasts, which in the days of Thutmose III was eleven days long, is credited in this calendar with twenty-four days; and summarizing the calendar as far as preserved, we find that there was an annual feast day of Amon on an average every three days, not counting the monthly feasts. Yet Ramses III later lengthened even the feasts of this calendar, so that the feast of Opet became twenty-seven days long and the feast of his own coronation, which lasted but one day as prescribed by the calendar, finally continued for twenty days each year. Little wonder that the records of a band of workmen in the Theban necropolis under one of his successors shows almost as many holidays as working days. All these lengthened feasts of course meant increased endowment and revenue for the service of Amon. The treasure rooms of this Medinet Habu temple still stand, and their walls bear testimony to the lavish wealth with which they were filled. Ramses himself in another record says: 'I filled its treasury with the products of the land of Egypt: gold, silver, every costly stone by the hundred-thousand. Its granary was overflowing with barley and wheat; its lands, its herds, their multitudes were like the sand of the shore. I taxed for it the Southland as well as the Northland; Nubia and Syria came to it, bearing their impost. It was filled with captives, which thou gavest me among the Nine Bows, and with classes (successive enforced levies), which I created by the ten-thousand....I multiplied the divine offerings presented before thee, of bread, wine, beer and fat geese; numerous oxen, bullocks, calves, cows, white oryxes and gazelles offered in his slaughter yard.' As in the days of the XVIIIth Dynasty conquerors, the bulk of the spoil from his wars went into the treasury of Amon.

The result of this long-continued policy was inevitable. Of the nearly three-quarters of a million acres of land held by the temples, Amon owned over five hundred and eighty-three thousand, over five times as much as his nearest competitor, Re of Heliopolis, who had only one hundred and eight thousand; and over nine

times the landed estate of Ptah of Memphis. Of the fifteen per cent. of the lands of the entire country held by all the temples, Amon thus owned over two-thirds. While, as we have stated, the combined temples owned in slaves not more than two per cent. of the whole population, Amon held probably one-and-a-half per cent., in number over eighty-six thousand five hundred, which exceeded by seven times the number owned by Re. In other items of wealth, like herds, gardens and groves, towns, ships, workshops and income in gold and silver, the same proportion is observable. Amon's estate and revenues, second only to those of the king, now assumed an important economic role in the state, and the political power, wielded by a community of priests who controlled such vast wealth, threatened to rival that of the Pharaoh. Without compromising with it and continually conciliating it, no Pharaoh could have ruled long, although the current conclusion that the gradual usurpation of power and final assumption of the throne by the High Priest of Amon was due solely to the wealth of Amon is not supported by our results. Other forces contributed largely to this result, as we shall see. Among these was the gradual extension of Amon's influence to the other temples and their fortunes. His high priest had in the XVIIIth Dynasty become head of all the priesthoods of Egypt; in the XIXth Dynasty he had gained hereditary hold upon his office; his Theban temple now became the sacerdotal capital, where the records of the other temples were kept; his priesthood was given more or less supervision over their administration, and the combined economic power of organized religion in this great state was finally controlled by the High Priest of Amon alone.

That Ramses III was solely or even chiefly responsible for these conditions is a common, but a mistaken, conclusion. However lavish his contributions to the sacerdotal wealth, they never could have raised it to the proportions which we have indicated. This is as true of the fortune of Amon in particular as of the temple wealth in general. The gift of over seventy miles of Nubian Nile shores (the Dodecaschoenus) to Khnum by the king was but the confirmation by him of an old title; and the enormous endowments enumerated in the great Papyrus Harris, long supposed to be the gifts of Ramses, are but inventories of the old sacerdotal estates, in the possession of which the temples are merely confirmed by him. The situation in which Ramses found himself was an *inherited* situation, created by the prodigal gifts of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties, beginning at least as far back as Thutmose III, who presented three towns in Syria to

Amon. It was generations of this policy, with its resulting vast accumulations of temple-wealth, which made even an able ruler like Ramses unable to oppose the insatiable priesthoods long accustomed to the gratification of unlimited exactions. Yet his treasury must have sorely felt the drain upon it, with its income gradually shrinking, while the demands upon it nowise relaxed. Although we know that payments from the government treasury were as slow in ancient, as they have been until recently in modern Egypt, yet, making all due allowance for this fact, it can hardly be an accident that in the reign of Ramses we can follow the painful struggles of a band of necropolis workmen in their endeavours to secure the monthly fifty sacks of grain due them. Month after month they are obliged to resort to the extremest measures, climbing the necropolis wall and, driven by hunger, threatening to storm the very granary itself if food is not given them. Told by the vizier himself that there was nothing in the treasury, or deceived by the glib promises of some intermediate scribe, they would return to their daily task only to find starvation forcing them to throw down their work and to gather with cries and tumult at the office of their superior, demanding their monthly rations. Thus, while the store-houses of the gods were groaning with plenty, the poor in the employ of the state were starving at the door of an empty treasury.

At this dangerous crisis the Pharaoh's power lay exclusively in his army and great bodies of foreign slaves of the crown. Against the powerful priestly coteries these foreign slaves were the only forces which Ramses III and his contemporaries could bring into play. Branded with the name of the king, these foreigners were poured into the ranks of the army in large numbers, augmenting the voluntary service of the foreign mercenaries already there. The armies with which Ramses beat off the assailants of his empire were, as we have already remarked, largely made up of foreigners; and their numbers constantly increased as the Pharaoh found himself less and less able to maintain the mastery in a situation of ever-increasing difficulty and complication. He was soon forced also to surround his own person with numbers of these foreign slaves. A class of personal attendants, already known in the Middle Kingdom by a term which we may best translate as 'butler,' originally rendered service to the table and larder of the nobles or the king. These slaves in Ramses' service were largely natives of Syria, Asia Minor and Libya, especially Syria, and as the king found them more and more useful, they gradually, although only slaves, gained high office in the

state and at the court. It was a situation precisely like that at the court of the Egyptian sultans of the Middle Ages. Of eleven such 'butlers' known to us in the royal service five were foreigners in places of power and influence, and we shall soon have occasion to observe the prominent rôle they played at a fatal crisis in his reign. While all was outwardly splendour and tranquillity, and the whole nation was celebrating the king who had saved the empire, the forces of decay which had for generations been slowly gathering in the state were rapidly reaching the acute stage. An insatiable and insidious priesthood commanding enormous wealth, a foreign army ready to serve the master who paid the most liberally, and a personal following of alien slaves whose fidelity likewise depended entirely upon the immediate gain in view—these were the factors which Ramses was constantly forced to manipulate and employ, each against the others. Add to these the host of royal relatives and dependents, who were perhaps of all the most dangerous element in the situation, and we shall not wonder at the outcome. The first discernible illustration of the danger inherent in the unhealthy situation is the revolt of Ramses' vizier, who shut himself up in the Delta city of Athribis. But he had miscalculated the power at his command; the place was taken by Ramses and the revolt suppressed. Peace and outward tranquillity were again restored. As the time for the celebration of the king's thirty-year jubilee approached, elaborate preparations were made for its commemoration. He sent the new vizier, Ta, southward in the year twenty-nine to collect the processional images of all the gods who participated in a celebration of the usual splendour at Memphis.

Something over a year after this stately commemoration a more serious crisis developed. The harem, the source of so many attempts against the throne, was the origin of the trouble. A queen in the royal harem, named Tiy, began furtive efforts to secure for her son, Pentewere, the crown, which had been promised to another prince. A plot against the old king's life was rapidly formed, and Tiy enlisted as her chief coadjutors a number of important personages whose service at court brought them near the Pharaoh's person. Six wives of the officers of the harem gate were also won to the enterprise, and they proved very useful in the transmission of messages from inmates of the harem to their relatives and friends outside. Among these inmates was the sister of the commander of archers in Nubia, who smuggled out a letter to her brother and thus gained his support. All was ripe for a revolt outside the palace, intended to accompany the murder of

the king and enable the conspirators the more easily to seize the government and place their pretender, Pentewere, on the throne. At this juncture the king's party gained full information of the conspiracy, the attempt on his life was foiled, the plans for revolt were checkmated, and the people involved in the treason were all seized. The old Pharaoh, sorely shaken by the ordeal, and possibly suffering bodily injury from the attempted assassination, immediately appointed a special court for the trial of the conspirators. The very words of the commission empowering this court indicate his probable consciousness that he would not long survive the shock, while at the same time they lay upon the judges a responsibility for impartial justice on the merits of the case, with a judicial-mindedness which is remarkable in an oriental despot who held the lives of the accused in his unchallenged power and who had himself just been the victim of a murderous assault at their hands. See p. 212.

Of the fourteen officials of the court thus commissioned, seven were royal 'butlers,' and among these were a Libyan, a Lycian, a Syrian named Mahar-baal ('Baal hastens'), and another foreigner, probably from Asia Minor. We see how largely the Pharaoh depended in his extremity upon the purchased fidelity of these foreign slaves. The flaccid character of the judges and the dangerous persistence of the accused is shown by a remarkable incident which followed the appointment of the court. Some of the women conspirators, led by a general compromised in the plot, gained such influence over the two bailiffs in charge of the prisoners, that the bailiffs were prevailed upon to go with the general and the women to the houses of two of the judges, who, with amazing indiscretion, received and caroused with them. These two indiscreet judges, with one of their colleagues, who was really innocent, and the two bailiffs, were immediately put on trial. The innocence of the third judge was made evident and he was acquitted, but the others were found guilty, and were sentenced to have their ears and noses cut off. Immediately following the execution of the sentence, one of the unfortunate judges committed suicide. Thereupon the trials of the conspirators continued with regularity, and from the records of three different prosecutions we are able to trace the conviction of thirty-two officials of all ranks including the unhappy young pretender himself, who was doubtless only an unfortunate tool, and the audacious general who had compromised the two judges. The records of the trial of queen Tiy herself are not preserved, so that we cannot determine her fate, but we have no reason to suppose that it was better

than that of all the others who, as ordered by the king, were allowed to take their own lives. The old king survived but a short time after this unhappy experience, and having celebrated a second jubilee, while the prosecution of his would-be assassins was still going on, he passed away (1167 B.C.), having ruled thirty-one years and forty days.

III. THE LAST OF THE RAMESSIDS AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE EMPIRE

The death of Ramses III was the beginning of the final catastrophe in the slow decline of the Egyptian empire. It introduced a long line of nine weaklings all of whom bore the great name of Ramses, and under them the world power of the Pharaohs rapidly disappeared. We see Ramses IV, the son of Ramses III, struggling feebly with the hopeless situation which he had inherited. Immediately on his accession the new king prepared, in his own behalf and that of his father, one of the most remarkable documents which has reached us from the civilization of ancient Egypt. In order that his father might prosper among the gods and that he himself might gain the benefit of his father's favour among them, the young king compiled for burial with the departed Pharaoh a list of the deceased king's good works. It contained an enormous inventory of the gifts of Ramses III to the chief divinities of the nation, besides a statement of his achievements in war and of his benefactions toward the people of his empire. All this recorded on papyrus formed a huge roll one hundred and thirty feet long containing one hundred and seventeen columns about twelve inches high. It is now called Papyrus Harris, and is the largest document which has descended to us from the early Orient. Accompanied by this extraordinary statement of his benefactions toward gods and men, Ramses III was laid in his tomb, in the lonely Valley of the Kings. Of its efficacy in securing him unlimited favour with the gods there could be no doubt; and it contained so many prayers uttered by Ramses III on behalf of his son and successor that the gods, unable to resist the appeals of the favourite to whom they owed so much, would certainly grant his son a long reign. Indeed it is clear that this motive was the leading one in the production of the document. It was characteristic of this decadent age that the Pharaoh should be more dependent upon such means for the maintenance of his power than upon his own strong arm, and the huge papyrus thus becomes a significant sign of the times. With fair promises of a long reign the priesthoods were extorting from the impotent

Pharaoh all that they demanded, while he was satisfied with the assured favour of the gods. The sources of that virile political life that had sprung up with the expulsion of the Hyksos were now exhausted. Indeed, as we have before indicated, the state was rapidly moving toward a condition in which its chief function would be religious and sacerdotal, and the assumption of royal power by the High Priest of Amon but a very natural and easy transition. Naturally the only notable work of Ramses IV, of which we know, is a quarry enterprise for the benefit of the gods. After an inglorious reign of six years he was succeeded in 1161 B.C. by the fifth Ramses, probably his son. The exploitation of the mines of Sinai now ceased, and the last Pharaonic name found there is that of Ramses IV. In quick succession these feeble Ramessids now followed each other; after a few years a collateral line of the family gained the throne in the person of a usurper, probably a grandson of Ramses III, who became Ramses VI, having succeeded in supplanting the son of Ramses V. The seventh and eighth Ramses quickly followed. They all excavated tombs in the Valley of the Kings, but we know nothing of their deeds. Now and again the obscurity lifts, and we catch fleeting glimpses of a great state tottering to its fall.

From the close of the reign of Ramses III to the first years of Ramses IX (1142 B.C.), only some twenty-five or thirty years elapsed, and the same High Priest at el-Kab who had assisted in the celebration of the jubilee of Ramses III was still in office under Ramses IX. Likewise the High Priest of Amon at Thebes under Ramses IX, Amenhotep, was the son of the high priest Ramsesnakht, who held the office under Ramses III and IV. The high priesthood of Amon, which had at least once descended from father to son in the XIXth Dynasty, had now become permanently hereditary, and while it was passing from the hands of Ramsesnakht to his son Amenhotep, with a single uninterrupted transmission of authority, six feeble Ramessids had succeeded each other, with ever-lessening power and prestige, as each struggled for a brief time to maintain himself upon a precarious throne.

Meanwhile, Amenhotep, the High Priest of Amon, flourished. He sumptuously restored the refectory and kitchen of the priests in the temple of his god at Karnak, built about ten centuries before by Senusret I. We see the crafty priest manipulating the pliant Pharaoh as he pleases, and obtaining every honour at his hands. In his tenth year Ramses IX summoned Amenhotep to the great forecourt of the Amon-temple, where, in the presence of the high-priest's political associates and supporters, the king presented him with a gorgeous array of gold and silver vessels, with costly

decorations, and precious ointments. The days when such distinctions were the reward of valour on the battle-field of Syria were long passed; and skill in priestcraft was the surest guarantee of preferment. As the king delivered the rich gifts to the high-priest he accompanied them with words of praise such that one is in doubt whether they are delivered by the sovereign to the subject or by the subject to his lord. At the same time he informs Amenhotep that certain revenues formerly paid to the Pharaoh shall now be rendered to the treasury of Amon; and, although the king's words are not entirely clear, it would seem that all revenues levied by the king's treasury but later intended for the treasury of the god, shall now be collected directly by the scribes of the temple, thus putting the temple to a certain extent in the place of the state.

All these honours were twice recorded by Amenhotep, together with a record of his buildings on the walls of the Karnak temple. Both the records of his gifts and honours are accompanied each by a large relief showing Amenhotep receiving his gifts from the king, and displaying his figure in the same heroic stature as that of the king—an unprecedented liberty, to which no official had ever before in the history of Egypt dared to presume. In all such scenes from time immemorial the official appearing before the king had been represented as a pigmy before the towering figure of the Pharaoh; but the High Priest of Amon was now rapidly growing to measure his stature with that of the Pharaoh himself, both on the temple wall and in the affairs of government. He had a body of temple-troops at his command, and as he gathered the sinews of the state into his fingers, gradually gaining control of the treasury, as we have seen, he did not hesitate to measure his strength with the Pharaoh.

Thebes was now rapidly declining; it had been forsaken as a royal residence by the Pharaohs two hundred years before, but it continued to be the burial-place of all the royal dead. There had thus been gathered in its necropolis a great mass of wealth in the form of splendid regalia adorning the royal bodies. In the lonely Valley of the Kings' Tombs, deep in the heart of the cliffs, slept the great emperors, decked in all the magnificence which the wealth of Asia had brought them; and now again, as at the close of the XVIIIth Dynasty, their degenerate descendants, far from maintaining the empire which they had won, were not even able to protect their bodies from destruction. In the sixteenth year of Ramses IX the royal tombs of the plain before the western cliffs were found to have been attacked; one of them, that of Sebekemsaf, of the XIIIth Dynasty, had been robbed of all its

mortuary furniture and his royal body and that of his queen violated for the sake of their costly ornaments. Although the authors of this deed were captured and prosecuted, the investigation shows sinister traces that the officials engaged in it were not altogether disinterested. Three years later, when Ramses IX had made his son, Ramses X, co-regent with himself, six men were convicted of robbing the tombs of Seti I and Ramses II, showing that the emboldened robbers had now left the plain and entered the cliff-tombs of the valley behind. Ramses II, who had himself despoiled the pyramid of Sesostri II at Illahun, was now receiving similar treatment at the hands of his descendants. The tomb of one of Seti I's queens followed next, and then that of the great Amenhotep III. Within a generation, as the work of plunder continued, all the bodies of Egypt's kings and emperors buried at Thebes were despoiled, and of the whole line of Pharaohs beginning from the XVIIth to the end of the XXth Dynasty, only one body, that of Amenhotep II, has been found still lying in its own sarcophagus; although it had by no means escaped spoliation. Thus, while the tombs of the Egyptian emperors at Thebes were being ransacked, and their bodies rifled and dishonoured, the empire which they conquered had crumbled to ruin.

At the accession of the last Ramses (1118 B.C.) we can discern the culmination of the tendencies which we have been endeavouring to trace. Before he had been reigning five years a local noble at Tanis named Nesubenebbed, the Smendes of the Greeks, had absorbed the entire Delta and made himself king of the north. No longer commanding the undivided resources of Upper Egypt, which he might otherwise have employed against Nesubenebbed, there was now nothing for the impotent Pharaoh to do but to retire to Thebes—if this transfer had not indeed already occurred before this—where he still maintained his precarious throne. Thebes was thus cut off from the sea and the commerce of Asia and Europe by a hostile kingdom in the Delta, and its wealth and power still more rapidly declined. The High Priest of Amon was now virtually at the head of a Theban principality, which was gradually becoming more and more a distinct political unit. Together with this powerful priestly rival, the Pharaoh continued to hold Nubia.

Long before the revolution which resulted in the independence of the Delta, the impotence of the Ramessids was discerned and understood in Syria. The Thekel and Peleset-Philistines, whose invasion Ramses III had for a time halted, had continued to arrive in Syria, as we have stated (p. 175). Seventy-five years after Ramses III had beaten them into submission, the Thekel were

already established as an independent kingdom at Dor, just south of the seaward end of Carmel. As we do not find them mentioned in the surviving records of the Israelites, we may assume that they were merged with the Philistines. Continually replenished with new arrivals by sea, these hardy and warlike wanderers from the far north could not have paid tribute to the Pharaoh very long after the death of Ramses III (1167 B.C.). In the reign of Ramses IX (1142-1123 B.C.), or about that time, a body of Egyptian envoys were detained at Byblus by the local dynast for seventeen years; and, unable to return, they at last died there. The Syrian princes, among whom Ramses III had built a temple to Amon, to which they brought their yearly tribute, were thus indifferent to the power of Egypt within twenty or twenty-five years after his death.

Under Ramses XII (or rather, XI), these same conditions in Syria are vividly portrayed in the report of an Egyptian envoy thither. In response to an oracle, Wenamon, the envoy in question, was dispatched to Byblus, at the foot of Lebanon, to procure cedar for the sacred barque of Amon. To pay for the timber, Hrihor, the High Priest of Amon, was able to give him only a pitiful sum in gold and silver. As Wenamon was obliged to pass through the territory of Nesubenedded, who now ruled the Delta, Hrihor supplied him with letters to the Delta prince, and in this way secured for him passage in a ship commanded by a Syrian captain. Nothing more unmistakably betrays the decadent condition of Egypt than the humiliating state of this unhappy envoy, dispatched without ships, with no credentials, with but a beggarly pittance to offer for the timber desired, and only the memory of Egypt's former greatness with which to impress the prince of Byblus. Stopping at Dor on the voyage out, Wenamon was robbed of the little money he had, and was unable to secure any satisfaction from Bedel, the Thekel prince of that city. After waiting in despair for nine days, he departed for Byblus by way of Tyre, having on the way somehow succeeded in seizing from certain Thekel people a bag of silver as security for his loss at Dor. He finally arrived in safety at Byblus, where Zakar-baal, the prince of the city, would not even receive him, but ordered him to leave. Such was the state of an Egyptian envoy in Phoenicia, within fifty or sixty years of the death of Ramses III. Finally, as the despairing Wenamon was about to take passage back to Egypt, one of the noble youths in attendance upon Zakar-baal was seized with a divine frenzy, and in prophetic ecstasy demanded that Wenamon be summoned, honourably treated and dismissed.

This, the oldest known example of Palestinian prophecy in its earlier form, thus secured for Wenamon an interview with Zakar-baal.

The unhappy Egyptian's extraordinary report says: 'I found him sitting in his upper chamber, leaning his back against a window, while the waves of the great Syrian sea were beating against the shore behind him.' In the remarkable negotiations which followed, the Phoenician prince quite readily admitted the debt of culture which his land owed Egypt as a source of civilization, saying: '(I admit that) Amon equips all lands; he equips them, having first equipped the land of Egypt, whence thou comest. For artisanship came forth from it to reach my place of abode; and teaching came forth from it to reach my place of abode.' At the same time he contemptuously repudiated all political responsibility to the ruler of Egypt, whom he never called Pharaoh, except in referring to a former sovereign. To make good his case his secretaries brought out their books to show that for generations the Pharaohs had liberally paid for the timber furnished them. The situation is clear. A burst of military enthusiasm and a line of able rulers had enabled Egypt to assume for several centuries an imperial position, which her unwarlike people were not by nature adapted to occupy; and their impotent descendants, no longer equal to their imperial rôle, were now appealing to the days of splendour with an almost pathetic futility. It is characteristic of the time that this appeal should assume a religious or even theological form, as Wenamon boldly proclaims Amon's dominion over Lebanon, where the Phoenician princes had, only two generations before, worshipped and paid tribute at the temple of Amon, erected by Ramses III. With oracles and an image of Amon that conferred 'life and health,' the Egyptian envoy sought to make his bargain with the contemptuous Phoenician for timber which a Thutmose III or a Seti I had demanded with his legions behind him. It was only when Wenamon's messenger, whom he had meantime dispatched to Egypt, returned with a few vessels of silver and gold, some fine linen, papyrus rolls, ox-hides, coils of cordage, and the like, that the Phoenician ruler ordered his men to cut the desired logs; although he had sent some of the heavier timbers for the hull of the barge in advance, as an evidence of his good faith.

As Wenamon was about to depart with his timber, some eight months after he had left Thebes, Zakar-baal told him of the fate of the Egyptian envoys of a former reign who had been detained seventeen years and had ultimately died in Byblus. With grim

humour he even offered to have Wenamon taken and shown their tombs—a privilege which the frightened envoy declined. Promising the prince the payment of the balance due him, Wenamon at last proceeded to embark. Escaping with the Phoenician prince's aid from a fleet of Thekel pirates hovering in the offing, he was cast by a storm on the shores of Alasa (? Cyprus). At this point his report breaks off, and the conclusion is lost; but here again, in Alashiya, whose king was practically his vassal, whom the Pharaoh had been wont to call to account for piracy in the old days of splendour (p. 98), we find the representative of Egypt barely able to save his life. This unique and instructive report of Wenamon, therefore, reveals to us the complete collapse of Egyptian prestige abroad and shows with what appalling swiftness the dominant state in the Mediterranean basin had declined under the weak successors of Ramses III. When Tiglath-pileser I appeared in the west about 1100 B.C., a Pharaoh, who was probably Nesubenebbed, feeling his exposed position in the Delta, deemed it wise to propitiate the Assyrian with a gift, and sent him a crocodile (p. 251). Thus all Egyptian power in Syria had utterly vanished, while in Palestine a fiction of traditional sovereignty, totally without practical political significance, was maintained at the Pharaoh's court.

For the conditions at Thebes there was meanwhile but one possible issue. The messenger who procured the timber for the sacred barge of Amon was no longer dispatched by the Pharaoh, but as we have seen, by the High Priest of Amon, Hrihor. The next year he had gained sufficient control of the royal necropolis at Thebes to send his people thither to re-wrap and properly re-inter the bodies of Seti I and Ramses II, which had been violated and robbed in the first year of Ramses X. The temple of Khonsu, left with only the holy of holies and the rear chambers finished since the time of Ramses III, was now completed with a colonnaded hall preceded by a court and pylon. The walls of these new additions bear significant evidence of the transition which was now going on in the Egyptian state. In the new hall the official dedications on the architraves, attributing the building to Ramses XI, are strictly in accordance with the conventional form, customary since the Old Kingdom. But around the base of the walls are words which have never been found in a Pharaonic temple before; we read: 'High Priest of Amon-Re, king of gods, commander in chief of the armies of the South and North, the leader, Hrihor, triumphant; he made it as his monument for "Khonsu in Thebes, Beautiful Rest"; making for him a temple

for the first time, in the likeness of the horizon of heaven.... That the commander-in-chief of the armies of the south and north was the real builder of the hall we can hardly doubt. Like the shadowy caliph, whom the Egyptian sultans brought from Baghdad to Cairo, and maintained for a time there, so the unfortunate Ramses XI had been brought from his Delta residence to Thebes, that the conventionalities of the old Pharaonic tradition might still be continued. Already at the close of the XIXth Dynasty we recall that Amon had gained possession of the Nubian gold-country; the high priest had now gone a step further and seized the whole of the great province of the Upper Nile, making himself 'viceroy of Kush.' He had likewise become 'overseer of the double granary,' who, as grain was always Egypt's chief source of wealth, was the most important fiscal officer in the state, next to the chief treasurer himself. There was now nothing left in the way of authority and power for the high priest to absorb; he was commander of all the armies, viceroy of Kush, held the treasury in his hands, and executed the buildings of the gods. When the fiction of the last Ramessid's official existence had been maintained for at least twenty-seven years the final assumption of the high priest's supreme position seems to have been confirmed by an oracle of Khonsu, followed by the approval of Amon. It was recorded in an inscription, very fragmentary and obscure, engraved on the door through which the modern visitor passes from the inner hall bearing the name of both Hrihor and Ramses XI, to the outer court, built by Hrihor, where the shadowy Pharaoh vanishes, and the high priest's name, preceded by the Pharaonic titles and enclosed in the royal cartouche, at last appears alone.

The military leadership of the ancient oriental world, which had normally been held by Asia, especially as we see it in the rule of the Hyksos, had as a result of their overthrow, passed to Egypt, which maintained it vigorously for nearly two centuries. With the death of Amenhotep III military supremacy was passing rapidly back to Asia, whence it had come. In the course of the XIIIth century, especially after the wars of Ramses II, the leadership of the ancient nations, as expressed in terms of *power*, had finally and decisively shifted to Asia. On the other hand, as expressed in terms of *culture and civilization*, the leadership which Egypt had gained and held from the rise of the earliest civilization in the fourth millennium before Christ, she continued to hold, and maintained her civilized supremacy until the leadership of the early world passed finally to Greece in the sixth century B.C.

CHAPTER IX

CONTEMPORARY LIFE AND THOUGHT IN EGYPT

I. RELIGION; IKHNATON'S REFORM

IN chap. ix of the first volume the discussion of Egyptian life, religion and literature was brought down to the end of the Middle Kingdom. The years which followed this, and which constitute the so-called Later Intermediate Period, were full of events of tragic significance for Egypt. Of the internal confusion of those days, and of the invasion of the Hyksos we know next to nothing, but when light again breaks on the darkness we find ourselves face to face with new conditions which vitally affect religion and every other aspect of life.

Once more a great Theban family has reduced chaos to order and united Egypt under its sway. But the old order has changed. Of the feudal system scarce a vestige remains, and its place has been taken by a state organization for ruling, administering justice and collecting revenues, which is directly under the control of the king through his vizier or viziers. This naturally brings into existence a vast body of major and minor officials, all of whom enjoy a certain standing in the state by virtue of their office. Now it has been explained in a previous chapter that the Egyptian mortuary cult, together with the hereafter which it involved, was in origin probably the privilege of kings alone, though, during the later days of the Old Kingdom and during the Middle Kingdom which succeeded, it had gradually been extended to the local chiefs and even to their underlings. The rise of the new official class in the XVIIIth Dynasty completed this process, which has been well termed the 'democratization of Osirianism,' Osiris having by this time become the god of the dead *par excellence*. It will be part of our task to trace the precise form which this process took.

In addition to this a still more important change had taken place. In the Middle Kingdom individual kings had subjected Nubia and made successful raids into Asia. But the conception of an Egyptian empire which should include both Nubia and Nearer Asia does not seem to have existed. The founders of the

XVIIIth Dynasty in their pursuit of the defeated Hyksos had advanced into southern Palestine. Their successors continued the conquest thus begun, and the result was the Asiatic empire of Thutmose III, lost by Ikhnaton and regained, in part at least, by Ramses II. These conquests stimulated the national consciousness in a manner hitherto unknown. The state-gods of Egypt became those of the known universe, and in this way there grew up a tendency to universal monotheism which culminated in the so-called heresy of Ikhnaton, doomed to failure perhaps only because its appearance was premature. This too we shall discuss, together with the question of what impression, if any, it made on the orthodox religion when this came to be restored.

Just as in the earlier periods, so also in the New Empire, our main body of religious texts is of a purely funerary character. This is doubtless due in some measure to the fact that fate has preserved for us the contents of tombs much more often than those of houses or temples. As the Old Kingdom had its Pyramid Texts and the Middle Kingdom its Coffin Texts, so the New Empire has its Book of the Dead. The term is a modern one and is a misnomer, as is also the name 'The Egyptian Bible' sometimes conferred on these texts. The truth is that the Egyptians themselves knew of no 'book,' but that there were current among them large numbers of spells or recitations, selections from which were combined on rolls of papyrus and placed in the tombs. No two rolls contain the same selection, and while some of those found in the tombs of the rich are over 50 feet long and contain as many as 130 spells, those found in the less magnificent tombs are often but a few feet in length and include only a few of the more vital sections. The funerary papyri of the New Empire which are known to us mainly come from the neighbourhood of Thebes, and it is therefore customary to regard the collection of over 160 spells drawn from these as constituting a 'Theban recension' of the Book of the Dead. Certain favourite groups of the more important of these spells were entitled by the Thebans 'The spells for ascending by day,' but for the collection as a whole the Egyptians had no name. A Saïte recension, mainly known from a magnificent papyrus at Turin, contains a few chapters not known to the Theban version.

With the exception of a few hymns to Re* and Osiris the contents of the Book of the Dead consist of charms and spells calculated to protect the deceased against the numerous perils of life in the hereafter. A comparison with the medical and magical papyri shows at once that there is no essential difference between

the spells used in ordinary life to avert disease and danger and those believed to be efficacious in the next world. We shall meet shortly with an excellent example of this. The names of a few of the spells will give a good idea of the contents of the rolls. Chapter 5 is a spell for preventing a man from being forced to work in the necropolis; Chapter 29 a spell for preventing a man's heart from being taken from him in the necropolis; Chapter 33 a spell for driving away the snake; Chapter 44 a spell for preventing a second death in the necropolis; Chapter 50 a spell by which a man may avoid entering in to the divine slaughter-block; Chapter 76 a spell for assuming any form one may wish to assume; Chapter 99 a spell for bringing the ferry-boat; Chapter 125 a spell for entering into the Broad Hall of Justice.

An important feature of the Book of the Dead consists in the illustrations or vignettes by which the texts are accompanied. These vary in detail from one roll to another, but the consistency observed is sufficient to show that their general lines were dictated by a powerful tradition. Like the spells themselves the illustrations which accompanied them had a magical value which served to increase the efficacy of the spells.

The texts are often obscure and difficult to translate. In origin they owe very little to the Pyramid Texts, but are under considerable obligations to the Coffin Texts of the Middle Kingdom, and further discoveries of Middle Kingdom material may show us that the obligation is even greater than at present appears. It is clear, however, that much of what was taken over from earlier times was sadly misunderstood. In these cases one of two things happened; either a garbled and miscopied version was preserved, which is unintelligible except in those cases where we have the original version before us, or else the obscure passages were modified or reconstructed in such a way as to make them intelligible in the light of the theological ideas of the time, though in many cases the sense thus given was far different from that intended by the original composer. Confusion was worse confounded, moreover, by the fact that in some cases parallel texts of slightly different tenour existed, and the priestly scribes in their anxiety to lose nothing generally combined these in a single text, often with disastrous results. It thus came about that many texts already difficult and obscure in Middle Kingdom times became in the Book of the Dead little more than a monstrous jumble of phrases.

A few examples will, however, be more striking than any further description, and for this purpose we shall choose spells 29,

99 and 125. Spell 29 is a 'Spell to prevent a man's heart from being taken from him in the necropolis.' So far as its obscurities permit of a translation it runs as follows: 'O messenger of all the gods, art thou come to take away this my heart of the living. This my heart of the living shall not be given to thee. Begone! The gods have heard my offerings; they fall on their faces. . . ' (rest unintelligible). Now it has not escaped the notice of some writers that this spell is of precisely the same type as those used for parallel purposes in the living world. In a papyrus known as the 'Charms for Mother and Child' (Papyrus Berlin 3027) the demons who may cause various diseases in children are warded off by the mother by means of charms of various kinds chosen from the animal, vegetable and mineral worlds, together with spells sometimes spoken over such charms. In one of the spells the demon is thus addressed: 'Art thou come to harm this child? I will not suffer thee to harm him. Art thou come to take him? I will not suffer thee to take him from me.' From this it is obvious that Chapter 29 of the Book of the Dead is nothing more or less than an application to the life hereafter of the ordinary Egyptian *hike*, 'magic power,' or however else we choose to translate it. The ethical significance of this fact, which is clearly of great importance, is a subject to which we shall return later.

For the moment we must return to our second example, Chapter 99. This, besides being, as is clear from its frequency in the papyri, an important chapter, is particularly suitable for our present purpose in that it has lately been published (by Grapow) in such a way as to show the Middle Kingdom and the New Empire versions side by side, and in that a portion of it has been subjected to an acute analysis by Sethe with a view to determining its structure and history. In fact it is the sole text from the Book of the Dead on which the full light of modern scholarship has as yet been turned.

The New Kingdom version of the chapter consists partly of a series of phrases in the following form: 'Tell me my name, says the mooring-peg. Mistress of the Two Lands in the Shrines is thy name.' Each part of the equipment of the ferry-boat asks the dead man to declare its name, and to each he replies with some complicated title drawn from Egyptian theology, the suitability of which to the particular object, if indeed there be any, we are usually unable to perceive. The point is clearly that the various parts of the boat will only perform their functions for the deceased if he enjoys that magic power over them which a knowledge of their hidden names alone can give, and the spell was

buried with him in order that when called upon for these names he might have them at hand.

Even more interesting than the name-spell is the so-called introduction which in some cases accompanies it. This, which at first sight is virtually unintelligible, has been shown (by Sethe) to be a combination and attempted reconciliation of four different texts. The first, which consists of a summons to an unnamed ferryman to bring over the boat in which the dead are ferried to the east side of the sky, is derived from the Pyramid Texts. The second is a much longer summons to one Turn-face, who in the Pyramid Texts figured as the ferryman, but who in our text is besought, not to bring the boat himself, but to awaken for this purpose another ferryman called Aken. Despite the subordinate and merely intermediate *rôle* which is here assigned to Turn-face, he is represented as asking the questions and making the usual excuses on the grounds of the loss of certain essential parts of his boat, just as though he were the ferryman himself. This is clearly a text in which Turn-face originally played the part of ferryman, but which has lost its original form owing to the influence of the fourth text shortly to be described. The third text contains a similar but obviously independent set of questions and answers, having no connection with the boat, between the dead man, who is addressed as a magician, and a being who meets him on his approach to the sky. This being is, by way of reconciliation with the second text in its original form, called Turn-face, though he is clearly no ferryman, and is merely requested to wake Aken. In the fourth text Aken himself is besought to bring over the boat. Like Turn-face in the second text, he excuses himself on the ground that the equipment of his boat is incomplete, and on the other hand, like the unnamed being in the third text, he addresses the deceased as magician and speaks to him with considerable respect. Thus the text as it has come down in Chapter 99 consists of four separate elements set side by side, not each in its original consistent form, but with alterations due to the desire to reconcile one with the other, resulting in a mass of inconsistency and absurdity.

The importance of this piece of analysis is that it shows how strong was the desire in the Egyptian mind to lose nothing of what religious tradition had handed down, even when the combination of various versions led to inconsistency, and it further proves how little value was attached to the actual meaning of the texts, unintelligibility appearing to detract in no wise from their magical value.

The most important chapter in the Book of the Dead is undoubtedly Chapter 125, for it has a considerable ethical content, and brings us face to face with the insoluble paradox of Egyptian thought and religion, the relation of ethics to *hike*, or magical power—'mana,' to use an anthropological term. This chapter which, though it makes its first appearance in the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty, is, to judge from the corruption of the text, considerably older in origin, is entitled 'Spell for entering into the Broad Hall of Justice.' The vignette represents the so-called Psychostasia or weighing of the soul. Within a hall whose roof is ornamented with flames of fire placed alternately with feathers, the symbols of righteousness, sits Osiris on a throne beneath a canopy. With him are Isis and Nephthys, and in some cases the four sons of Horus. In the background are seen the gods, as judges or assessors, forty-two in number, perhaps to correspond with the number of the nomes of Egypt. In front are the scales with the heart of the deceased in one pan and in the other the feather, the sign of justice or righteousness. Anubis presides over the actual operation of weighing, and Thoth, the scribe of the gods, stands by with pen and papyrus to record the result. The other prominent figure in the scene is a composite monster, crocodile in front, lion in the middle and hippopotamus behind, who stands ready to devour the dead man should the verdict of the scales be unfavourable to him.

Before going any further it is worth while to notice the position assigned to Osiris in this scene. In the Middle Kingdom we found but obscure hints of a judgment of the dead, and no undoubted reference to Osiris as the judge. Here in the XVIIIth Dynasty we find the idea firmly established, and the now fully popularized Osiris dominates the funerary aspect of religion.

The text which accompanies the vignette is a composite one formed by the juxtaposition of two texts of different origin but of somewhat similar content. These are the longer and the shorter 'Declarations of Innocence,' frequently known by the paradoxical name of the 'Negative Confessions.' The older and shorter of the two consists of denials of certain definite sins. The later and longer shows a marked preference for denials of evil qualities rather than evil deeds, and at the same time increases the number of denials to forty-two, to suit the number of assessors.

It would be a mistake to regard these two lists as giving a complete sketch of the Egyptian moral code, and a still greater mistake to try to deduce any development of ethical thought from

a comparison of the two, on the assumption, probably not incorrect, that they are in origin of different dates. The lists should be regarded as purely conventional in composition; corruption may have considerably altered their original form, and we are at liberty to say no more than that the actions mentioned in them were regarded as sinful by the Egyptians of this period.

And here lies the paradox to which allusion has been made above. The chapter embodies an ethical belief, namely that happiness in the future life is dependent on morality in this life. Yet the very chapter itself is nothing more or less than a spell which enables the dead man to avoid the consequences of the judgment by a knowledge of the right words to say and the right sins to repudiate. Nay, the matter is even cruder than this, for it is not necessary that he should actually know these things by heart, but merely that a papyrus roll on which they are inscribed should be laid beside him in the tomb (see pp. 51, 197). How are we to explain this inconsistency?

The answer is that there is no explanation. In dealing with the earlier periods we found that the Egyptian exhibited a wonderful capacity for holding two inconsistent beliefs at one and the same time. In the Middle Kingdom the moral consciousness had awakened and the idea had grown up that future happiness was in some way or other dependent on present virtue. This must have been to many people, as indeed it still is, a most unattractive doctrine, but a simple means of avoiding its logical consequences lay to hand. By virtue of the action of *hike* the mere verbal repudiation of sins in the prescribed manner was just as effective as actual innocence, indeed even the mere possession of a papyrus containing such a repudiation would suffice (see vol. I, p. 354 sq.). And let it not be thought that the two beliefs, that in the necessity of innocence, and that in the all-powerfulness of *hike*, were held by different individuals or different classes of persons. Chapter 125 is in itself an indubitable proof that both views were combined. The best we can believe of the Egyptian is that he really thought that virtue, and perhaps virtue alone, would procure him happiness in the future life, but that he also had the comfortable feeling that if the standard of his conduct was not sufficiently high he might yet be saved by the agency of the spells of *hike*. And yet it would be difficult to support this view by documentary evidence.

The consequences of this invasion of the funerary realm by *hike* need hardly be pointed out. The priests and their scribes, in whose hands the collections of spells lay, were provided with a

means of acquiring wealth and influence which they did not fail to utilize to the utmost, and it is not impossible that the increased power of the priesthood thus obtained was a circumstance which precipitated, if it did not actually cause, the religious revolution of Ikhnaton.

But we must now turn from Osiris-worship and the cult of the dead to the religion of the state. In the Middle Kingdom the sun-god Re, syncretized with Horus, the falcon-god, under the form Re-Horus-of-the-Horizon, had, at Thebes the original home of the ruling family, been combined with the local god Amon. Since the kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty were also of Theban origin this combination had suffered no change at the beginning of the Dynasty. Suddenly, however, in the reign of Amenhotep IV or, as he later styled himself, Ikhnaton, we find ourselves face to face with a complete change, for the king and his court are entirely given up to what seems to be a true monotheistic worship of the sun-god in a new form. No event in Egyptian history has appealed more strongly to the modern world than this so-called 'heresy of Ikhnaton.' The king himself has been hailed as the 'first individual in history' (cf. p. 127 *sq.*), and there are those who have seen in his ideas an anticipation of much that is of value in Christianity. Although we do not as yet know as much as we should wish about the 'reformer,' it is becoming more and more apparent that the reform was not a mere momentary excrescence on the body of Egyptian religion, as some have supposed it to be. However much influence we may attribute to the personality of Ikhnaton himself, it remains true that the development was in a very great measure the outcome of gradually changing conditions, and, as such, unavoidable; though in other hands it might have taken a less extreme and hence perhaps more permanent form.

It has already been pointed out that the XVIIIth Dynasty, and more especially the reign of Thutmose III, saw the rise of the conception of an Egyptian world-empire, embracing both Nubia and Syria, and thus constituting a very considerable fraction of the known world. The sun-god, as state-god of Egypt, had hitherto held no sway outside Egypt itself, and, though the pious might regard him as the creator of Egypt, it had doubtless never occurred to them that he had also created the world at large. Now, however, Re had carried the victorious Egyptian arms over 'all that the sun's disk embraces,' to use the Egyptians' own term, and he had thus become a world-god instead of merely the

local god of Egypt. How far the Egyptian nation at large felt this it would be difficult to say, but there can be no doubt that in the minds of the more thoughtful it was not overlooked. Thus the ground was prepared, or appeared to be, for an attempt at a universal religion with the sun-god for its chief, if not its only deity.

There was another factor which affected the situation. We have seen how the power of the priesthood in general had been strengthened by the ever-increasing encroachment of *hike*, or magic power, upon the funerary world. Nowhere was this gain in influence so astonishing as in the case of the priesthood of Amon of Thebes. Under the form of Amon-Re-Horus-of-the-Horizon this god received the lion's share of the booty brought from Asia by the victorious Egyptian kings, and his temples became more and more wealthy in gold, silver, and precious stones, in cattle and herds, and in Syrian slaves. Many writers have been so much struck by this that they have interpreted the 'reformation' of Ikhnaton as little more than an attempt to break away by means of a change in religion from a tradition which placed in the hands of the priests of Amon a power which was beginning seriously to clog and confine the liberty of the sovereign. There may be a measure of truth in this point of view, but it is right to insist that it is only an inference, and that, while nothing in contemporary records contradicts it, so also there is nothing to prove it. The fact is that what rendered the religious revolution of Ikhnaton possible was a complex of causes the most important of which were the tendency towards a wider conception of religion due to the expansion of Egypt, the desire of the kingship to rid itself of the limitations imposed on it by the over-powerful priesthood of Amon, and the accession to the throne of a peculiar genius in the person of Ikhnaton.

The bare facts of the case are simple enough and have been already related (chap. vi). They may be briefly summed up as follows. In the sixth (possibly even the fourth) year of his reign, Amenhotep IV, still a youth of less than twenty years of age, if we may believe the evidence of his mummy, transferred his capital from Thebes to the district now known as el-Amarna, 300 miles farther downstream, where he founded the city of Akhetaton, 'Horizon of the Disk,' at or about the same time changing his name from Amenhotep, 'Amon is satisfied,' to Akhenaton (or Ikhnaton), 'The Disk is pleased' (p. 113). Here he proceeded to devote himself with his court to the worship of the sun-god under the name of 'Horus-of-the-horizon, rejoicing

in his horizon, in his name of *Shu-who-is-in-the-disk*.' The new religion lasted little more than a dozen years. At the end of this time Ikhnaton died, and, after attempts by two ephemeral successors to carry on the system, the cult of Amon was re-established, the court returned to Thebes, and the city of Akhetaton fell into ruin.

Up to a few years ago it was customary to believe that this entire movement was a product of the brain of Ikhnaton and that there had been no foreshadowing of it in earlier years. This we now know to be incorrect. An inscribed block of stone found re-used in the pylon of Harmhab at Karnak shows a figure of the sun-god in the traditional form of the falcon-headed Horus accompanied by the full name '*Horus-of-the-horizon, rejoicing in his horizon, in his name of Shu-who-is-in-the-disk*.' The cartouches of the king who stands before the god are those of Ikhnaton, but a close examination has shown that they have been altered in antiquity from those of his father Amenhotep III. The significance of this is considerable. There must have been already in Thebes in the reign of Amenhotep III a temple of the sun-god under the name previously supposed to have been given to him by Ikhnaton himself. In form, however, the deity was still represented as a falcon-headed god instead of in the guise of a disk giving forth rays ending in human hands, a guise which became usual and invariable early in Ikhnaton's reign.

This is undoubtedly the greatest discovery which has been made for many years in regard to the Aton-worship. It throws the origins of Ikhnaton's 'heresy' back to the reign of his predecessor on the throne, though whether they go back still further is disputed (p. 114, n. 1). It is precisely this fact that makes it now necessary to see in the movement not merely the personal influence of an original genius, but also the inevitable product of the conditions of the time. Having traced the beginnings of the movement back to the reign of Amenhotep III, we need not be surprised at finding in a hymn to the sun-god dedicated by two brothers, architects of this king, a very close anticipation of Ikhnaton's hymn to the disk, in which the universality of the sun's sway in the world is already recognized.

Ikhnaton, then, found the movement already in being, and by giving it a more definite content and form, and devoting his time to it to the exclusion of the claims of his kingdom in Egypt and his empire in Asia, now threatened with destruction by Hittites and Habiru, turned it, as it were, on to an unprofitable side-track, where it could only come to a standstill.

What exactly was the nature of the cult as practised by the king and his court? It seems to have been more contemplative than practical, and nothing has struck the moderns as more astonishing in the Disk-hymns than their total lack of ethical content. At the same time Ikhnaton cannot be deprived of the credit of having approached very close to the conception of a universal monotheism. Some have tried to deny him this credit. It is true that the occurrence in the hymns of such words as 'Sole god beside whom there is none other' proves nothing, this phrase being used quite impartially of various deities in polytheistic Egypt. It is true that Ikhnaton himself, up to his fifth year at least, had not abandoned all the gods of Egypt. It is true that while on many old monuments his agents chiselled out even the word for 'gods,' yet on others the names of various gods remained unerased. Nevertheless in Akhetaton there is no sign that any god other than the Aton or Disk was worshipped. The reference to the burial of the Mnevis bull at Akhetaton dates from as early as the sixth year, and is merely a sign of attempted compromise with the priesthood of Heliopolis, the centre of sun-worship from time immemorial. The retention of the 'Two Goddesses' name in the royal titulary is a piece of formal conservatism which proves nothing whatever; in the oft-quoted references to the Nile in the hymns the river appears not as a god but merely as a river, and finally the claim that Ikhnaton was no monotheist because he called himself the Good God (like every other Egyptian king) and the 'Child of the Disk,' and allowed himself to be worshipped, has more subtilty than sense in it.

The reformer undoubtedly aimed at monotheism, though the extreme conservatism of the country he ruled may have forced him to make some formal and unimportant concessions to polytheism. In the sense that he worshipped the sun he did not introduce a new religion, for sun-worship had been for centuries the state-cult. He did not even reject the names Re and Horus, both ancient titles of the sun-deity. We know so little of the true nature of the sun-cult of Heliopolis that we cannot attempt to say how far he accepted this and how far he modified it.

To what extent he succeeded in impressing his cult upon the people at large we are not yet in a position to judge. Future excavation and a proper study of the material already available may do much to enlighten us on this point. It is, however, clear that in regard to the funerary cult some concessions to custom were made. Canopic vases, *ushabti*-figures (p. 51) and heart-scarabs continued to be used, and the tomb-walls at el-Amarna still show

the traditional scene of the farewell to the dead and the cutting off of the leg of a live calf.

Side by side with the revolution in religion went a revolution in art. At the time of writing a fierce controversy rages in Germany as to whether the now well-known artistic style of Ikhnaton began immediately at his accession, or whether there was a short period at the beginning of his reign when the normal Egyptian style with its rigid conventions was still followed. The decision of this question, though interesting to the specialist, is hardly likely to throw much light on the main problems of the reformation. What is important to realize is that not later than the sixth year of the reign a new and freer style of art was in use. This naturally did not arise out of nothing, and we may surmise that the king, finding in some particular artist or school of artists new tendencies in art which would serve to differentiate the new religion more strongly than ever from the old, encouraged the new school by placing the state contracts in its hands, and making its style the official style of Akhetaton and perhaps of all Egypt. See pp. 120, 411 *sqq.*

Why did Ikhnaton's attempt fail? It failed for two reasons. In the first place it lacked that spirit of compromise with the established religion which was an indispensable condition of successful change in Egypt. That the sun-god should be worshipped under a new name and a new form was in itself little or nothing; but that Amon should be suppressed, his temples lie idle and his name be erased from the monuments was more than Egypt had stood or would stand (see p. 126). In the second place, the movement failed because the new religion was of a purely contemplative character, absorbing its votaries to the exclusion of all other employments whether political or diplomatic. While Ikhnaton and his court were singing hymns to the sun an empire was being lost to Egypt in Asia, and we have but to read the great decree of Harmhab, the first king of the restored religion, to realize the extent to which Egypt had become disorganized internally during the heresy.

It is generally said that the revolution left no mark on Egyptian religion. This may be almost literally true. It is difficult to find in the later developments of religion any feature which could possibly be derived from the Aton-worship. At the same time, unless we know more of the inner meaning of the cult, we are hardly in a position to identify its possible effects. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that there is evidence of the existence of a new element in the religion of the XIXth Dynasty which, it may

be urged, can hardly have been inspired by anything in the Aton-worship. For many years there have been known a number of votive and memorial stelae, mostly found at Thebes, the humility of whose dedicators stands out in strong contrast to the self-satisfaction typical of the Egyptian worshipper. The most famous of these is a stela now at Berlin, dedicated to Amon by a certain draughtsman, Nebre, and his son Pay, as a thank-offering for the recovery from illness of Nekhtamon, also a son of Nebre. The following quotations will give a good idea of the whole:

Beware of him (Amon), repeat his name to son and to daughter, to great and small. Declare him to generations and to generations, to those that are not yet born. Tell of him to the fishes in the stream and the birds in the air. Repeat his name to him who knows him not and to him who knows him. Beware of him. Thou art Amon, the lord of him who is silent, coming at the call of the poor. I called to thee when I was in trouble, and thou didst come and didst save me; thou didst give breath to the poor and didst rescue me who was in bondage. . . . I made for him praises to his name because of the greatness of his might. I cried 'Lord of the poor' before him in the presence of the whole land for the draughtsman Nebamon when he lay sick and about to die, being in the power of Amon because of his sin. . . . While the servant was wont to sin yet was the Lord wont to be gracious. The Lord of Thebes spends not a whole day in wrath. His anger lasts but for a moment and there is nought remaining.

What a contrast is this to the formal Declaration of Innocence in the Book of the Dead, or to the bombastic utterances of the typical stela, 'I gave bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked. I was one whom his father loved and his brethren approved.' Another stela of type similar to that dealt with above contains an appeal to the god Ptah from one who had been struck blind in consequence, as he thought, of having sworn falsely by the god. Coming, as they do, after centuries of self-satisfied protestations of innocence, these simple prayers strike a note which finds a much more sympathetic echo in the modern mind than anything else in Egyptian religion, even in the Aton-worship. For we have a belief in punishment for sin here on earth, a doctrine of humility and a conception of a merciful god. What is the place of this in the development of Egyptian religion? We still know too little of it to say. It can hardly have any direct connection with the Aton faith, and we can only suppose that it was a temporary phase affecting only the poorer classes at a certain period of the XIXth Dynasty, and that in it we catch a precious if fleeting glance of a simpler, purer faith which had held sway throughout among the poorer and humbler Egyptians, and which at this period managed to find momentary expression. See also p. 160 *sq.*

Apart from this peculiar and interesting manifestation, the development of Egyptian religion is one of movement towards complete sacerdotalism, culminating in the passing of the temporal power from the hands of the king into those of the chief priest of Amon. The steps in this change were gradual. Thutmose III had made use of the priesthood of Amon to secure his own elevation to the throne over the head of his brother by means of a trumped-up oracle of the god. In return for this he seems to have been forced to make the chief priest of Amon head of all the priesthoods of the land. The consequences of this are easily foreseen. Henceforward the whole policy of the state can be guided by the Amon-priesthood by a judicious employment of oracles. We know little of their use at an earlier date than the XVIIIth Dynasty, but from that time onward they become remarkably frequent. The vast armies of workmen in the Theban necropolis were accustomed to settle their differences by having recourse to an image of the dead king Amenhotep I, the patron god of the cemetery, which announced its decision by nodding its head. An interesting memorial tablet found at Abydos shows us an oracular image of the dead king Aahmes I being carried in a sacred barque on the shoulders of four priests to settle a dispute as to the ownership of certain lands. The culmination of this system is seen in an inscription of Ramses II in which the king relates how, anxious to make an election to the office of high priest of Amon, he had recited to the god the names of all the likely candidates, and the god had nodded approval on hearing that of a certain Nebweneef, who was thereupon installed. It is clear enough from this that the priests were now making use of oracles to retain the succession to the great priestly offices in the hands where they would have them. There could be but one end to the process. In the reign of the last Ramses the crown passed from the head of the Pharaoh to that of the chief priest of Amon and commander of the armies, Hrihor.

: From this moment onward the old trunk of Egyptian religion failed to put forth a single new shoot. Thebes became a mere sacerdotal principality, and sank into such a lethargy both physical and moral that she was rapidly surpassed in importance by the cities of the Delta, and Amon became a minor deity. Osiris-worship, however, as a popular cult never lost its hold, and, despite the attempted resuscitation of the ancient sun-worship in the Saïte period, Osiris, under the form of Osiris-Apis or Serapis, completely dominated both state and popular religion in Greek times. See above, p. 157.

II. LAW

Perhaps the most striking feature in Egyptian religion is its easy detachment from morality by the force of *hike* or magical power. But although, in consequence of this, the Egyptians neither had nor could have a sound philosophical or religious theory of ethics, this did not in practice prevent them from having a moral code. This is exposed to some extent in the Declarations of Innocence in the Book of the Dead, but we may gain an even closer and more precious view of it by an examination of the legal code. Oddly enough, although the Greek writers assure us that the Egyptians codified their laws, and although the inscription in the tomb of Rekhmire informs us that the vizier sat in the court to do justice with the forty rolls containing the law open before him, yet no fragment of any of these rolls has come down to us. Indeed, we know remarkably little about Egyptian law in the concrete and not very much concerning the spirit in which it was administered. Of the latter, however, we do catch a glimpse in the famous inscription known as the Installation of the Vizier from the above-mentioned tomb. In this the Vizier, the supreme legal functionary in the state, next to the Pharaoh, is enjoined to 'take heed that thou do all things according to what is in the law. . . . Behold men expect the doing of justice in the conduct of the Vizier. Behold that is its usual. . . since the days of the God. Behold the name given to the Vizier's chief scribe; Scribe of Justice is what he is called. As for the office in which thou givest audience there is a hall of judgment therein. And he who shall do justice before all men is the Vizier.' See above, pp. 45 *sqq.*, and for Harmhab's work, p. 133 *sq.*

Of the constitution of the courts we do not know very much. In the XIXth Dynasty we find two Great Courts, each presided over by a Vizier, one at Thebes and the other at Heliopolis. In addition to these there must also have been Local Courts. The inscription of Mes reveals one such at Memphis, constituted apparently by the 'Notables of the Town,' and in the reign of Ikhnaton a dispute as to a debt was settled by a similar Local Court (Berlin Papyrus 9875). In the Abbott Papyrus (reign of Ramses IX) the court which tries the tomb-robbers is called the Great Court (*Qenbet*) of Thebes, and consists of the Vizier and seven other officials. In the trials recorded in Papyrus Mayer A neither the name of the court nor its composition appear, but the Vizier presides. The Harem Conspiracy under Ramses III was

dealt with by a special court appointed by the king for the purpose (p. 186 sq.). A much earlier case of a special court occurs in the inscription of Uni of the VIth Dynasty, where Uni himself, with one other judge, is appointed by the king to deal with a charge against the Royal Wife (vol. 1, p. 292).

Egyptian criminal law is mainly known to us from a series of papyri relating to certain *causes célèbres* which unfortunately all date from about the same period, and that not an early one. In the XXth Dynasty the professional robbers of tombs had become so daring that they no longer hesitated to attack and plunder the royal tombs in the western valleys of Thebes. The situation seems to have been firmly dealt with, and a number of papyri, the most famous of which are the Abbott and the Amherst, have preserved for us the official account of the trials. A small papyrus at Vienna actually records the inspection of a number of such documents, which had been filed for reference in two pottery vases. One or two of the papyri which have survived may, though not without uncertainty, be identified with some of those on the Vienna list, but in any case it is clear that the various tomb robbery papyri scattered among the museums of Europe and America once formed part of a great legal *dossier* stored away in Egyptian times, and discovered, we know not where, by the modern Arabs, only to be dispersed by sale.

From these documents as a whole we can obtain a rough idea of the procedure in these criminal cases. The first act was for the officials of the Pharaoh to visit the scene of the crime and satisfy themselves as to the facts, taking some of the thieves with them to identify the scene of their crime. This done, the evidence was heard. And here the methods of Egyptian law display a certain crudity. Each witness, whether suspected of complicity or not, was given a preliminary bastinado. If this did not achieve the desired result it could be repeated. For example in Papyrus Mayer A we read 'There was brought the scribe of the army, Ankhefenamun, son of Ptahemhab. He was examined by beating with the stick, the bastinado was given on his feet and his hands; an oath was administered to him, on pain of mutilation, not to speak falsehood. They said to him, Tell the manner of your going to the places with your brother. He said, Let a witness be brought to accuse me. He was again examined. He said, I saw nothing. He was placed under arrest in order to be examined again.'

The evidence was all given on oath, and taken down, if we may believe the records, word for word as spoken. The court,

having heard the evidence, gave its decision, but the assessment of the penalty seems to have been left in the hands of the Pharaoh. It is well, however, to remember that these tomb-robberies, on account of their importance, may have been dealt with in a special manner, and it may perhaps be unwise to argue from them as to the normal practice of Egyptian criminal law.

The same reservation must be made in the case of the famous trial for the Harem Conspiracy in the reign of Ramses III. A plot against the king had been hatched in the royal harem, and, to make matters worse, one of the queens was implicated in, if not mainly responsible for, it. Worse still, magic rolls and figures of wax were among the methods employed by the conspirators. The plot was discovered, and the king, apparently disgusted with the whole affair, which involved many of those who were his intimates in his daily life, appointed a special court of twelve to deal with the case and to deliver and execute the sentences without further reference to himself. The mandate of the court runs as follows. 'As for the talk which people are making I know nothing of it. Hasten ye to examine it. Ye shall go and examine them and cause those who are to die to die by their own hand without (my) knowing it. And ye shall execute punishment upon the rest without my knowing it.' Different groups of the conspirators were tried by different groups of the judges, and the affair was further complicated by the fact that two of the judges 'forsook the good instruction which had been given to them' and entered into an intrigue with some of the women of the harem. These two persons were punished by the cutting off of their noses and ears, while the rest of the guilty were suffered to take their own lives, apparently in the court. No reference was made to the Pharaoh, and the criminals, or some of them, were actually tried under false names (see p. 187 *sq.*).

Turning now to civil law, we are at once struck by the high development of the conception of property in Egypt. It is first brought to our notice in connection with mortuary endowments. As early as the IVth and Vth Dynasties we find a series of inscriptions—the most complete is in a tomb close beside the pyramid of Khephren—in which the owner of the tomb declares that he has left to his mortuary priest certain property and ~~serfs~~ the revenues from which are to accrue to the priest in return for the keeping up of the funerary cult and offerings to the testator after his death. This in itself is straightforward. But the testator then proceeds to tie up the property. The legatee may not sell or bequeath it, but it descends to his children and to anyone else

who may share with them the duties of funerary priest to the testator. In the case of the legatee's leaving the guild of priests of which he is at present a member the property reverts to the guild.

The careful treatment of questions of property of which the above is an example is admirably exemplified in the records of the Middle Kingdom. In order to be convinced of this it is only necessary to glance through the complicated and yet perfectly clear wills among the Kahun Papyri. Still more striking from the same point of view are the contracts made by the nomarch of Siut, a certain Hapzefa, in the time of the XIIth Dynasty. This noble wished to secure that certain offerings should be made to him, and certain ceremonies performed for him after his death. He therefore made a series of formal contracts, ten in number, with various members and groups of members of the temple staff of Upwawet, of whom he himself was chief priest. Now the property and rights which he held as nomarch of Siut and as chief priest of Upwawet were not his to dispose of, being held in fief from the king. On the other hand he had a hereditary right to certain portions of the income of the temple by reason of the fact that his family belonged by birth to the priestly college. These last emoluments he describes as his 'paternal estate,' and it is these which he barter in perpetuity with the various contracting parties in return for certain offerings which they are to give him after his death.

The contracts are all cast in a definite mould, doubtless that prescribed by Egyptian civil law. One example (No. 3) will give an adequate idea of their nature.

Contract which the nomarch and chief of priests, Hapzefa, deceased, made with the staff of the temple, for the giving to him of bread and beer on the 18th day of the first month of the Inundation Season, the day of the feast of Uag. List of what (is to be) given (to him). [Here follows a list of the ten members of the staff and the number of jugs of beer, *kefen*-cakes and white loaves to be given by each.] What he has given to them for it is 22 temple-days, out of his paternal estate, not out of the nomarch's estate, namely 4 days to the chief priest and 2 days to each priest. Now he said to them, A temple-day means one 360th part of a year. Ye shall divide all that accrues to this temple in bread, in beer, and in flesh of the daily rations. The resulting 360th part of the bread, beer and everything else, will be the income of the temple for one of these days which I have given to you. Behold it is my property belonging to my paternal estate, not to the estate of the nomarch, since I am the son of a priest like any other of you. Behold these temple-days shall pass in turn to any staff of the temple which shall come into being, on condition that they provide for me this bread and beer which they are to give me. And they agreed thereto.

The concise and accurate form of the contract needs no comment. The distinction between Hapzefa's paternal estate, which is alienable, and his estate *qua* nomarch, which is not, has already been remarked. Not less striking than this is the legal definition of the income of a 'temple-day' as the income of a whole year of 360 days divided by 360, *i.e.* the income of an average day. But the most surprising contract of all is No. 6, in which, as nomarch of the Lycopolite nome, he makes a contract with the chief priest of Upwawet, *i.e.* himself, for certain roast meat and beer to be offered to him after his death. He gives in return two temple-days, from the property of his paternal estate, not out of his property as nomarch. Here Hapzefa as a private individual is making an agreement with Hapzefa as chief priest, that is as an official, which agreement is to be binding on his heirs on the one hand and on his successors in office on the other. It is true that the contract can hardly come into operation until his death, but it is actually made during his life, and we thus have a recognition by Egyptian law of a dual legal personality, and of the possibility of contracting between the two sides of the same personality.

For the period of the New Empire we have an admirable example of a civil action in the inscription of Mes. A certain Neshi had received from king Aahmes I, probably in recognition of services in the war of expulsion of the Hyksos, a tract of land. This, after Neshi's death, descended from heir to heir until, in the reign of Horemheb, the Great Court of Heliopolis was called upon to divide the estate between several co-heirs for whom a certain Werel was made administrator. The subsequent history of the property is difficult to follow, and there seems to have been considerable litigation. Finally in year 18 of Ramses II a certain Khay wrested the lands by fraud from the then occupier, Nubnofret, by producing in court forged title-deeds and falsifying a register. The villainy passed undiscovered and Khay took possession. Nubnofret's son, Mes, on attaining manhood, appealed against this verdict. In his speech before the Court he pleads that the title-deeds of Khay were forgeries, and calls witnesses to prove his own descent from Neshi, the original owner of the property. The defendant Khay speaks next, and merely recapitulates the incidents of the original trial, making no attempt to prove descent from Neshi. Evidence on oath is next heard, and finally the verdict is given, in words now lost, in favour of Mes. On another wall of the tomb in which this inscription is recorded are fragments of copies of the documents used by Mes, but the state of the text does not enable us to say at what point in the

trial he used them. The light thrown on Egyptian civil law by this inscription is creditable. We find that records existed of trials held many years back, and that there was a register of properties with their owners.

An equally interesting though less known document is the Berlin Papyrus 3047, which, when intact, contained the complete account of a civil law suit tried before a court in the royal judgment-hall in Thebes. The papyrus is badly mutilated, and no full-sized facsimile has been published. The plaintiff claims that certain lands over which he and his brothers, for whom he is executor, have rights are being reaped by someone else, apparently a certain overseer of the slave-prison, notwithstanding the fact that he himself has made them over to the temple of Mut, reserving, however, as it would seem, the right to a certain proportion of their produce. The plaintiff first makes his deposition. Next the court makes a statement which is mostly lost, and then Wennefer, a priest of the Temple of Mut, makes a deposition on behalf of the temple. The court now gives judgment. Then the plaintiff, in whose favour the decision has clearly gone, says to the priest of Mut, 'Behold my land. . . you are to give me the half of its produce in grain and vegetables,' and the trial ends with the reply of Wennefer, 'I will do it; behold me, I will do it, I will do it.'

III. THE SCIENCES

It is now necessary to turn to other aspects of Egyptian life and activity. The Egyptian mind, as has been noted above, did not run in the direction of pure philosophy. On the other hand, it showed no sloth in grappling with the problems of every day life. The result is that the practical sciences, so far as they were not blighted by the all-destroying influence of magic, were in a flourishing condition.

In a land where it was necessary to cultivate every inch of fertile soil, and where, as we have seen, the conception of property was so highly developed, mensuration must have been of vital importance. The evidence of the pyramids of the Old Kingdom proves that even in this period the Egyptians were capable of making measurements of extraordinary accuracy. It need therefore not surprise us to find in the reign of Apophis, a Hyksos ruler, a papyrus (Papyrus Rhind, now in the British Museum) which consists of a series of mathematical problems with their solution and explanation, and which claims to be a copy of a still older

document. There is also a similar papyrus at Moscow, one problem from which has been published, and there are also a few mathematical fragments among the Middle Kingdom papyri from Kahun.

The Egyptian system of counting was decimal. A single stroke stood for 1, two strokes for 2 and so on. The number 10 was expressed by a sign like a capital U reversed, 20 by two such signs, and so on up to 90. There was a new sign for 100, another for 1000, and others for 10,000, 100,000 and 1,000,000. This system shows us that for practical purposes there was no limit set to counting. But in actual use the system had a serious defect. In order to write the number 985 it was necessary to write 5 units, 8 tens and 9 hundreds, or 22 signs in all. It is true that in the hieratic script this process was considerably shortened by the use of contractions such as two long horizontal strokes for 8 instead of two rows of four vertical strokes each. But in a sense this only further complicated the system, for there arose in this manner a separate hieratic sign for each unit, for each of the tens, each of the hundreds and so on. The discovery that in a decimal system ten figures could be made to express all possible numbers by giving them values as units, tens, hundreds, etc., according to their position was never reached by the Egyptians.

Fractions had no terrors for them, though they dealt only in those whose numerator was unity. The sole exception to this was two-thirds, which was originally written 'the two parts': two-thirds of a number was taken directly and one-third could only be obtained by halving this. The consequence of this limitation with regard to fractions was that tables had to be made up for reducing every fraction whose numerator was not unity to a sum of fractions whose numerators were unity. As direct multiplication by numbers other than 2 (and rarely 10) was unknown, these tables needed only to deal with fractions whose numerator was 2, and the Rhind Papyrus therefore begins with a table for reducing to unity-fractions all 2-fractions from two-fifths to two over a hundred-and-one. Thus two-fifths equals a third plus a fifteenth, and so on. These results are obtained mainly by trial. They are used constantly in the problems of this Papyrus.

The fundamental processes of addition and subtraction, both mere questions of counting in the strict sense of the term, gave the Egyptian scholar little difficulty. But when he came to multiplication he was in serious difficulties, for he memorized only the results of multiplication by 2, instead of by all numbers up to 12 and even beyond, as we do. Thus, to multiply by 5, it

was necessary to multiply by 2, then by 2 again, which was equivalent to multiplying by 4, and lastly to add on the original number. Division was of course merely the converse of multiplication, and was done purely by trial. To divide 27 by 4 the reckoner took the number 4, doubled it, quadrupled it, halved it, quartered it and so on. Among the figures thus obtained he noted that $16 + 8 + 2 + 1$ made 27, and that therefore the quotient when 27 was divided by 4 must be $4 + 2 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}$ or $6 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}$ (since $\frac{3}{4}$ was not used). Apart from this multiplication and division by 2 the Egyptian had but one weapon in his mathematical armoury, namely the peculiar power alluded to above of taking two-thirds of a number in a single operation. One-third was arrived at indirectly by halving this, and from this one-sixth, one-ninth and so on could be obtained. With these primitive means, however, he managed to get much further than might have been expected. Among the purely arithmetical problems of the Papyrus we find the division of fractions by fractions, the equal division of ten loaves among various numbers of men, and the solution by trial of equations of the form $x + \frac{x}{a} = b$.

The same methods were applied to mensuration. The area of the rectangle was correctly determined as the product of its length and breadth. This was obviously a mere matter of observation, once the conception of units of area as apart from units of length had developed. The area of the circle was obtained by squaring eight-ninths of its diameter. We have no idea how this approximation was arrived at, but it is a remarkably good one, giving the value of π as 3.16.... Whether the Egyptians had successfully determined the area of the scalene triangle is a matter of doubt, owing to the uncertainty in meaning of some of the technical terms used. The formula given is half the base multiplied by the *meryet*. This last is generally taken to be the length of a side (the triangle in the figure which accompanies the problem is isosceles), but it may just possibly be the perpendicular height, in which case the solution is correct.

Passing on to solids we find the volume of the cylinder determined as the product of its base (approximately ascertained as above) into its vertical height. The volume of a parallelepiped is correctly given as the product of its three dimensions. Practical rules are also given us for determining how many bushels of corn can be placed in a granary of given measurements, without actually working out the volume of the granary. It is hardly necessary to remark that such problems as this show a complete

understanding of the nature of three-dimensional units. In the Moscow Papyrus the volume of a truncated pyramid is given as $\frac{h}{3}(a^2 + ab + b^2)$, where a and b are the sides of the squares which bound the figure top and bottom respectively and h is the height, but whether vertical or slanting is not quite certain.

A number of problems deal with the determination of the slope or batter of the sides of a pyramid of given base and height. This is a purely practical matter, the result being given in the form of so many palms per cubit, and intended for the use of the stonemason who had to dress the outer blocks of the pyramid. The remaining problems of the Rhind Papyrus are all purely arithmetical, but all deal with practical problems, the numbering of cattle, the food of a poultry farm, the number of loaves of bread or jugs of beer of a certain size which can be made from a fixed quantity of grain, etc.

Of the application of mathematics to astronomy there is very little trace. It is true that the length of the solar year had been fairly accurately determined, but this was done in the first place by observation of the heliacal rising of Sirius or Sothis, which happened to correspond rather closely with the first rise of the Nile. In other words, it was a matter of observation and involved no calculation whatever (vol. 1, p. 168).

At the same time the aspect of the heavens was carefully studied, and the various groups of stars were divided into constellations according to the forms which they presented to Egyptian imagination. The material at our disposal for study is unfortunately rather late in date, running from the XIXth Dynasty down to Roman times, and consists mainly in tables and pictures of stars from the roofs of royal tombs and of temples. Five planets seem to have been known, identified generally with Venus, Mercury, Mars, Saturn and Jupiter. Perhaps the most striking documents are the star-tables in the tombs of Ramses VI and Ramses IX. In these the heaven is regarded as represented or occupied by the figure of a squatting man, and the position of certain prominent stars is mapped out on this figure for every fortnight of the year, such and such a star being said to be over the left eye, such and such another over the right ear, and so on.

Among the learning of the Egyptians medicine found a place. No fewer than four considerable papyri dealing with the subject have come down to us, while a recently re-discovered papyrus treats of surgery, though of a very elementary kind, and a fragment from Kahun attests the existence of veterinary treatises.

As early as the Old Kingdom we find references to the *wr swnw* or chief doctor. A certain Khuy, who bore this title in the royal court, is described as 'interpreter of a difficult science.' The Egyptians themselves attributed a hoary antiquity to the beginnings of their medical knowledge. A section of the Berlin Medical Papyrus, which also occurs in the Ebers Papyrus, is stated to have been found 'in an ancient script in a chest of documents beneath the feet of the majesty of king Usaphais. After his death it was brought to the majesty of king Send on account of its excellence.' These names take us back to the earliest dynasties, and, indeed, the portion of the papyri to which the heading refers contains peculiarities of writing and syntax not inconsistent with a very early origin.

Like religion, the science of medicine was permeated by the blighting influence of magic, which made any serious progress impossible. Of our five main papyri one contains little beyond a series of spells to be recited at the taking of certain medicines. The medicaments here occupy an entirely subordinate place, and the proportions in which they are to be mixed are not even given. Thus the document stands half way between the purely magical 'Spells for Mother and Child' (Papyrus Berlin 3027), in which the child is protected against disease by the recitation of spells by the mother, and the more serious medical papyri, such as the Ebers. One or two examples will serve to give an idea of this London Papyrus. 'Receipt for driving the blood from a wound. Fly-dung and vinegar placed thereon. Incantation. The weak was carried off by the strong (repeat backwards). The weak is saved; he smites the strong. This against that.' A recipe for the healing of burns consists of a long incantation telling how Horus was once burnt in the marshes, and cured by the milk of his sister Isis. The remedy to be applied has relation to the incantation, for it consists of various vegetable products, mixed and stirred up with the milk of the mother of a male child. Another incantation against a disease called *thent-aamu* is said to be 'in the language of Keftiu' (see p. 280 and note), and yet others are 'in the language of the foreigners,' perhaps more particularly 'the Bedouins.'

Putting aside the whole paraphernalia of magic, can we discern in Egyptian medicine anything of real value? To answer this question we must consider the Egyptians' knowledge of anatomy, the correctness of their diagnoses, the nature of their drugs, and the method of their application. Seeing that they were in the habit of opening bodies for mummification, their opportunities for the

study of human anatomy must have been unrivalled. Yet they seem to have made little use of them. They had, it is true, taken cognizance of the existence and position of the larger organs, an achievement of no very great merit, but in their attempts to go beyond this they failed badly. Having observed the great blood-vessels which enter and leave the heart, they had evolved a vessel-theory which is twice exposed in the Ebers Papyrus, with considerable variations. The various vessels were said to lead from the heart to different parts of the body, so many to each leg and arm, so many to the liver, and so on. According to one account there were forty in all, according to another only twelve. The circulation of the blood was quite unknown, for they thought that these vessels conveyed various substances: air, water, blood, mucus and other materials. Disease was held to be caused by failure in their functioning, and a long section of the papyrus is devoted to recipes for cooling, calming, vivifying, freshening and reducing the activity of these vessels.

It is clear that a system of medicine could not with any success be based upon such a mass of misconception and invention as this. It only remains to ask whether the Egyptian *materia medica* has any empirical value. Here there is no doubt that an affirmative answer must be given. There are many things for which vinegar, ointment, olive-oil, milk, beer, honey, castor-oil, cummin and such common substances are beneficial. It is further probable that many of the plants contained in these prescriptions which we are as yet unable to identify were efficacious for the diseases for which the Egyptians used them. Let us not deny to this great nation that knowledge of the medical effects of various natural substances which is possessed by even the most savage people of modern times. The majority of the recipes contain at least one of a small group of medicines such as those enumerated above. These formed the kernel of the prescription, and if ignorance and superstition insisted on adding the excreta of animals and flies together with other less abominable if equally useless ingredients, these can hardly have prevented the really useful portions of the whole from doing their work and 'proving most efficacious,' as the Egyptians loved to add at the end of their favourite recipes.

Our papyri tell us little about diagnosis. The nature of the disease is generally taken for granted, and the supposed remedy prescribed. The new Smith Papyrus and certain sections of Ebers, however, show that diagnosis was attempted. 'If you are treating a man with a pain in the abdomen and all his limbs are heavy, you are to lay your hand on his abdomen. If you find his abdomen swollen

and it comes and goes beneath the fingers, then shall you say, 'This is a weariness of eating. Stop him eating forthwith. You are to make for him every kind of purge.' Here the section consists, as often, of three parts: examination, diagnosis and prescription. The examination is, however, always of a very elementary nature.

In the method of applying drugs some discrimination is naturally shown. External complaints are as a rule treated externally by poultice or fomentation. Inhalation or fumigation is rare. Internal medicines are often marked to be taken in water or milk, in many cases for four successive days, this number appearing to have a special efficacy in medicine.

A special section of Egyptian medicine dealt with gynaecology and the diseases of children. In this section is a method for detecting whether a child will live or not 'on the day of its birth. If it says *ny* (yes?), that means it will live. If it says *mbi* (no), that means it will die.'

This by no means exhausts the domain of medicine, for the doctor was expected to drive out vermin from the house, to prevent a snake from coming out of his hole, to keep rats from devouring the grain in the barn, to drive out a bad smell from a house or a garment, and to prevent mosquitos from biting. Even in the preparation of toilet prescriptions the doctor was called upon. He had a remedy for beautifying the skin, for preventing the hair from falling, and even for causing the hair of a hated rival (the word is feminine gender) to come out.

IV. LITERATURE

The changes which transformed Egyptian religion were not without their effect on literature (see above, p. 16059.). Much though there is both in quantity and quality in the New Empire we cannot help feeling that the great age of Egyptian writing has passed with the Middle Kingdom. There is no group of writings in the later period which could compete in literary merit with such a combination as *Sinuhe*, the *Eloquent Peasant* and the *Proverbs of Ptahhotep* (see vol. 1). The reason for this is difficult to find, and it may be that we are simply face to face with the old and insoluble problem, why art flourishes more at one period than at another, though the conditions of the two periods seem equally conducive to successful artistic activity. It might be thought that the failure of the New Kingdom is merely apparent, and that fortunate discoveries will yet force us to alter our opinion. That this is improbable is clear from the fact that, as the numerous fragments of schoolboys' copy-books show, the great works of

the Middle Kingdom were still the favourite subjects for 'copy-work' in the New Empire, a sure sign that little of equal merit had arisen to take their place.

From one point of view this is strange, for one might have confidently expected that the great victories of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties would prove a sharp stimulus to literature. Yet to these we seem to owe little beyond the Victory Hymn of Thutmose III, the so-called Poem of Pentewere (see below), and a series of not too brilliant historical and semi-historical stories. Religious literature, however, occasionally reached quite a high level, especially in the hymns to the sun-god (e.g. Leiden Papyrus 350) and in the hymns and prayers of the Aton faith. At the same time the Book of the Dead is on the whole a dull successor to the Pyramid and Coffin Texts.

In secular writing the literary forms of the Middle Kingdom were by no means abandoned, and in the Maxims of Ani, and the Teachings of Dwauf (Papyrus Sallier II) we have a continuation of the very popular 'Instructions' of older days. The first of these works seems but a feeble echo of the far more piquant Proverbs of Ptahhotep, but the second holds something that is new to us. It is an exaltation of the profession of literature. Dwauf is taking his son Pepi up the Nile to set him to school and exhorts him to strenuous efforts by recounting the toils and difficulties which beset every trade and profession save that of the scribe. The piece has been not ill-described as the Satire on the Professions. 'I have never seen the smith,' says the speaker, 'as an ambassador, nor the goldsmith as a messenger (?). But I have seen the smith at his work at the mouth of his furnace, his fingers like the crocodiles (in their rugosity?), and he stank more than eggs or fish.'

The art of story-telling, so admirably exemplified in the Middle Kingdom in Sinuhe and the Shipwrecked Sailor, had not been altogether lost. In Papyrus Harris 500 we have a naïve tale known as the Enchanted Prince. A childless king is granted a son by the gods, and at the birth the Hathors decree him a destiny, 'He shall die by the crocodile or the snake or again the dog.' The father, anxious to save his son from the fate decreed, shuts him up in a house of stone in the desert. But the prince not only contrives to obtain a puppy for companion, but eventually wrings from his father a reluctant consent to his going out into the world. 'What is to come of it if I sit idle here? Behold I am ordained to three fates. Let it be granted me to do according to my heart's desire. Surely God will do what is in his heart.' He

sets off with his dog and comes to the land of Naharin in the north-east of Syria. Here he finds that the king of the land has shut up his daughter in a lofty tower, and promised her hand to whosoever shall succeed in flying up to her window. Concealing his identity, the prince joins the competitors and wins the princess, despite the objections of her father, who believes him to be merely the son of an Egyptian officer. He discloses the secret of his fates to his wife, who implores him to have the dog killed, but in vain. She next saves him from the first of his fates in the form of a snake, which attacks him while he is asleep. The rest of the papyrus is incomplete and obscure. The expected crocodile, however, makes his appearance, together with a giant whose function in the plot is not evident. The last lines leave the prince in considerable trouble with the crocodile. It needs no prophet to tell us that he will escape this peril only to be done to death by some misplaced zeal on the part of the faithful dog. The story is clearly told, but compared with *Sinuhe* or the *Shipwrecked Sailor* it is the work of a child as against that of a grown man. Vocabulary and phraseology are very limited and the constant repetition of a few groups of words is so tedious that despite our interest in the ultimate fate of the prince we view the mutilated end of the papyrus without a pang.

Distinctly higher, from the stylistic point of view, must be placed the *Story of Anubis and Bet* contained in the d'Orbiney Papyrus. It has a particular interest in that it contains an anticipation of the history of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. At first sight it seems a perfectly straightforward fairy-tale, but there is a considerable probability, judging by the name Anubis, and by some of the incidents, that the story has a religious background.

In some of these stories a historical setting is attempted. The warlike exploits of the kings of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties had appealed strongly to the story writer and to this fact we owe some of our knowledge of Egyptian history. Thus, Papyrus Sallier I contains the famous tale of Sekenenre and the Hyksos referred to in vol. 1, p. 314, while in Harris 500 we have an account of a stratagem whereby Thutmose III captured the town of Joppa (p. 84, above). Naturally the student of Egyptian history will exercise caution in making use of this material, for it is often difficult to distinguish fact from fancy.

Among the same group of texts must be placed the description of Ramses II's fight with the Hittites and their allies at the town of Kadesh. This, known wrongly by the name of the Poem of Pentewere, who is merely the scribe who made our papyrus copy

of it (Papyri Raifet and Sallier III), was written by an unknown author to please the vanity of the king after his return from narrowly escaping disaster at Kadesh. It was inscribed on the walls of three temples in Egypt.

To the same martial inspiration we owe the famous Hymn of Victory dedicated by Thutmose III to Amon and inscribed on a slab of black granite found in the Amon temple at Karnak. The composition is in parts strophic in arrangement, and is in the form of a speech placed in the mouth of the god. Two strophes will give an idea of the whole.

I have come.

I granted thee to trample on the great ones of Syria;
I spread them beneath thy feet in their lands.
I caused them to see thy majesty as Lord of the Rays,
When thou didst shine in their faces in my image.

I have come.

I granted thee to trample on the dwellers in Asia;
To smite the heads of the Asiatics of Retenu.
I caused them to see thy Majesty equipped with his splendour,
When thou didst seize the weapons of warfare in thy chariot.

From these hymns of victory and accounts of royal prowess it is distressing to turn to the last of the historical papyri of this period, the Story of Wenamon. This tells of the adventures of a certain Wenamon, who, in the reign of Ramses XII, was sent by the chief priest of Amon, Hrihor, to the ruler of Byblus in Syria to ask for timber for the sacred barque of Amon. The main value of this document lies in the sad picture it gives us of the position of Egypt, now compelled to beg and to give a price for the wood of Lebanon which Thutmose III and Ramses II would have exacted as tribute. See p. 192 sq.

The rest of the secular literature of the period, apart from law-documents, accounts, and the day-books of temples, cemeteries and fortresses, consists mainly of letters, actual or model. The latter we owe to the fact that letter-writing played a prominent part in the education of the scribe, with the result that numbers of model letters have come down to us with the master's corrections in the margin. The following is an admirable example of this style of writing, and comes from the collection of model letters contained in Papyrus Bologna 1094. 'The scribe Meh of the armoury of Pharaoh says to the scribe Uhem. Don't play the man of no intelligence who has no education. Though one spends the night in teaching you, and spends the whole day in teaching you, yet you hearken to no advice, but follow your own counsel.

The ape is obedient when he is brought from Ethiopia; men can teach lions and subdue horses, but as for you, your like is not known in the whole world. Don't forget it.'

Another of the same series is of still more mundane tenour. 'The scribe Uhem greets his lord the scribe Meh of the armoury of Pharaoh. This is to inform my lord that the vizier has sent three youths, saying, Place them as priests in the temple of Merenptah Hetephermaat in the estate of Ptah. But they seized them and took them to . . . , saying, they shall be soldiers. Do thou make haste and overtake them, and write to me what is their position. Moreover, do thou seek out the merchant (or possibly, Pashuy, a proper name) and see whether he has come from Syria. Further, do thou hurry hither from Memphis, for my heart is sick and I am unable to write to thee. Do thou send the servant Tinen, and write to me of thy condition by the hand of everyone who comes hither from thee. May thy health be good.'

A peculiar development of the epistolary style is the satiric letter as exemplified by Papyrus Anastasi I. The argument is as follows. A scribe of the royal stable named Hori has received from his colleague Amenemope a letter which he considers shows a complete lack of epistolary skill. Hori undertakes in his reply to show his friend how a letter ought to be composed, and to surpass him at every point in dealing with precisely the same topics. Among other tests of skill Hori propounds several mathematical problems which he regards his rival as incapable of solving, jeers at him for his pretensions as a traveller, and cross-examines him on the subject of a journey in Syria, of the geography of which region Amenemope shows himself totally ignorant. Finally Hori comforts him with the hope that with time and application he too may become equally proficient (see p. 326 *sq.*). The appeal of this type of literature to the modern mind is not very direct, but its popularity in Ancient Egypt is attested by the existence of excerpts from it on no fewer than eight ostraca and a papyrus.

No account of Egyptian literature of the New Kingdom would be complete without some mention of its admirable love songs. The best known of these are contained in a collection known as 'The beautiful joyful songs of thy sister whom thy heart loves, who walks in the fields.' These have been so frequently quoted that it may be advisable to give an instance from a less well-known composition found inscribed on an ostrakon of the XIXth or XXth Dynasty. 'The love of my beloved leaps on the bank of the stream among . . . A crocodile lies in the shallows, yet I go

down into the water and breast the wave. My courage is high on the stream and the water is as land to my feet. It is her love that makes me strong. She is a book of spells (?) to me. When I behold my beloved coming my heart is glad, my arms are spread apart to embrace her; my heart rejoices because of its . . . like . . . for ever, since my beloved came. When I embrace her my arms are spread and I am as one who is in the Incense Land, as one who carries perfume. When I kiss her her lips are opened and I am made merry without beer. Would that I were her negress-slave who is in attendance on her so should I behold the hue of all her limbs.'

As erotic poems these love lyrics are not unfit to compare with such compositions as the Song of Solomon, and they display an imagination and a mastery over metaphor and simile with which we might have failed to credit the Egyptians of the New Empire had this section of their literature not come down to us.

CHAPTER X

ASSYRIA

I. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN COAST-LANDS

TRAFFIC and intercourse in the Near East are dependent on two factors—water and animals. The bank of a river, presuming that it is not rendered impassable by forests or mountains, will always provide a route for a wayfarer on foot, from its mouth to its source. But if the traveller essay to strike away from it, to cross country which is either desert or sparse of water, his risks of dying of thirst are great, until the water-holes are known to him either by his own discovery, or by hearsay from the inhabitants. It is then that the horse comes to aid the adventurer, who is thus able to make his day's journey twice or three times as long, from one water-pan to another, or escape attack by fleeing at a gallop where formerly he must rely on his own heels alone.

It was the introduction of the horse from the East which, perhaps more than any one factor, changed the face of international politics. Where in previous times man had depended on ass and camel and his own slow pace, he now was able to traverse the length and breadth of the land with horse or mule; the ass must yield in power to both, and the camel, excellent on the flat, cannot climb rocks in colder altitudes.

It was the Kassites who really introduced the horse into Babylonia, although it had already been known in the time of Hammurabi (vol. I, p. 501). It must surely have been in common use some time before the Kassites dominated Babylonia in the eighteenth century, for it entered Egypt about the time of the Hyksos conquest, *c.* 1800 (?) B.C., together with the Semitic word for 'chariot,' *markabata*, the same as the Hebrew *merkabhah*. The obvious assumption is, of course, that the Hyksos brought it in with them. Even Murshil II, the Hittite (*c.* 1355–1330), in his cuneiform inscriptions used, like any Babylonian, the word *anshu.kur.ra*, 'the beast from the East,' for the horse.

With this tremendous increase in pace and power, paralleled by our use of motor-lorry and aeroplane in the East during the

latter part of our Mesopotamian campaign, the political horizon changed, and Assyria and Babylonia had to adapt themselves accordingly. Troops and merchants could travel long distances with comparative safety; the different nations were no longer able to shut themselves within their own ring-fences. The beginning of the second millennium shows an extraordinary quickening of political conversations between Asia Minor, Egypt and Mesopotamia; the el-Amarna tablets from Egypt, the scattered tablets from the Palestine mounds, the great finds of Hittite tablets at Boghaz Keui, all tell the same tale of interchange of diplomatic correspondence, with intermarriage between Royal Houses, such as would hardly have been suggested as possible in the third millennium.

It must not, however, be supposed that there had been no hardy and reckless spirits to explore neighbouring lands before the introduction of the horse. For instance, Egypt had long been in some kind of possession of the turquoise mines in the rocky fastnesses of Sinai, which had been secured for her by expeditions even as far back as the Ist Dynasty. Later on is told the exciting Egyptian story of Sinuhe, who, in the reign of Amenemhet I of the XIIth Dynasty, made his way through the Palestinian lands, luxuriant with vines, figs and olives (vol. 1, pp. 226 *seq.*). On the Babylonian side there is little record of individual travel, although perhaps the Legend of Gilgamesh marks the admiration of the Sumerian for bold exploits in solitary wandering, which may well have some foundation in fact. There are the rather dubious legends of Sargon in the west as far as the Mediterranean, and the more satisfactory stories of Gudea ranging foreign lands in search of wood and stone; but these are the campaigns of warriors and not the wanderings of single wayfarers. Nevertheless, in spite of this lack of stories, there must have been frequent mercantile traffic between land and land with caravans strong enough to be secured against robbery, plying up the banks of the two rivers and thence diverging whither the rich and safer roads led them. Practically the only district which merchants had to avoid were the deserts west of the Euphrates which were only to be crossed with the greatest difficulty.

With the spread of the horse went one of the great inventions of the ancient world, the cuneiform character. It was adopted by practically all the nations of the Near East as a medium for the exchange of diplomatic correspondence; Egypt, Syria, Mitanni, Hanigalbat and the Hittite country all borrowed it from the Tigris valley about this time: Van adopted it at a later period;

Elam had already long absorbed it. Some of these chancelleries preferred to retain even the Semitic language of Babylonia as a *lingua franca* for their communications to foreign powers; others, more ambitious, attempted to apply the cuneiform signs with their Babylonian values to their own languages, in which they then wrote their correspondence. Egypt recognized the futility of this, as did the Kassites; the Hittites wrote in Semitic Babylonian side by side with their native language spelt out laboriously in cuneiform. To this fortunate circumstance of the almost universal adoption of cuneiform on clay by the ancient world, we owe most of our knowledge of the politics of the fifteenth century B.C.¹

To go back for a moment to the preceding century, the sixteenth, let us examine the relations between the great lands of the civilized world, Egypt, Hatti, Assyria, Babylonia and Elam. Of these the Egyptians and the Hittites were the two pre-eminent; the Kassites in Babylonia were shortly to take the third place, but these were merely cuckoos in the nest, without great inventive capacity, and markedly inferior to the first two. As for Assyria, it was as yet only a very small state barred out from the west by the powerful kingdom of Mitanni and, in a less degree, Hanigalbat, and by the Aramaean tribes of the Middle Euphrates. Elam, again, in the far south-east was now a kingdom to itself, but at first without grave menace to the flat lands below her to the west.

This was the period when Egypt, having thrown off the Hyksos yoke, was beginning to overflow into the fertile lands of Palestine. Not merely had the Shepherd Kings been driven back into Asia, but the irresistible wave which had thrust them forth surged over into Syria, where the impetuous Thutmose I carried his standards as far as the brown waters of the Euphrates. But there was another power besides Egypt in the arena, with equal

¹ The chronology of the earlier part of the Kassite period is difficult to settle. We are now approaching a time when we have the actual letters which passed between Egypt, Babylonia and northern Syria. Then, in addition, we have the later *résumés* afforded by the Synchronous History, not always above suspicion, and by Chronicle 'P,' on which the same comment may be made. Finally, we have the recently published important series of chronological tablets from Ashur, which give the Kassite contemporaries for Assyrian kings, but even here the scribes made serious errors. In these circumstances it is impossible to reach conclusive results and the chronological scheme which has been adopted must be accepted with these reservations. All these dates therefore must be regarded as approximate. See the Appendix.

capacity for expansion, springing forth from the oak-clad hills of Anatolia. Long before, the Hittite ruler, Murshil (Murshilish) I, probably three centuries or more before the raid of Thutmose I to the Euphrates, according to the description of his exploits on a clay tablet in his own native tongue, swept down through the Taurus passes from Boghaz Keui over the Amanus to Halpash (Aleppo) and took it. Following the bank of the Euphrates down its course, his freebooters raided Babylon. Indeed, this may be the raid mentioned in one of the Chronicles as happening in the reign of Shamash-ditana. It helps to fill out our understanding of Kassite history, and throws a light on the Egyptian campaigns of the later time, for although Egypt was subsequently able to expand as far as the Euphrates, the Hittites apparently as yet ignored her. That is to say, a Hittite expedition to Babylon troubled little about exposing its flank, its line of communications, and its retreat by the River, to attack by the Egyptians. If this really be the truth of the case, it is a clear indication of the political conditions at the beginning of the second millenium.

Assyria appears at this time to have been temporarily overshadowed by the power of its western neighbour, Mitanni, the boundaries of which reached the left bank of the Euphrates. So strong was this state in the third quarter of the fifteenth century that its king Shaushshatar was able to invade Assyria and carry off from its chief city, Ashur, a great gate of gold and silver for re-erection as a trophy in the Mitanni capital, Washshukkani. If the early kings of Assyria really were Mitannians whom the Semites had subsequently ousted, the hostility is easily explicable (see vol. 1, p. 452 *sq.*).

Two solid buffers therefore prevented the kingdoms of Assyria and Babylonia at this time from taking any very active part in the Palestinian and Syrian wars in the sixteenth to fourteenth centuries. These were, first, the people of Mitanni to the north-east of Syria, and, secondly, the desert itself to the east of Palestine. The battle-area lay west of the Euphrates, where Hittite, Mitannian, Amorite and Egyptian were to fly at each other's throats over the possession of these fertile lands; Assyria and Babylonia were by comparison isolated, and, therefore, while the great powers, the Hittite and Egyptian, were exhausting themselves in these two or three centuries of perpetual fighting, Assyria was free to build a firm base for her own future empire by extending her conquests over the northern area and confining within a narrow compass the southern kingdom ruled by the Kassites until the twelfth century B.C.

With the beginning of the fifteenth century, after this expansion of Hittite and Egyptian across each other's paths, sprang up a long vendetta, with intervals of peace enforced by treaties between the two. Each sought the coast-lands of the eastern Mediterranean, and made warlike expeditions thither, and with this aim each used every endeavour to strengthen the forces at his disposal. Mitanni, which could at any moment threaten the eastern flank of an army in Syria, was courted equally by both; its royal family was bound by ties of marriage with Hatti and Egypt. Indeed, intermarriages between the courts had become very fashionable; even Egypt received into the royal harem a princess from remote Babylonia about 1400. Equally effective as a diplomatic aid were the *douceurs* of gold which those states whose mines provided it were able to send to those whose favour they courted. Many a king, like a spoilt child surfeited with presents, became surly if he felt entitled to be dissatisfied with the small amount of gold sent, and he did not hesitate to grumble. This habit of the Oriental has never been more openly displayed than in some of the letters of this period.

With the end of the sixteenth century Thutmose III (1501-1447) set out to complete the work of his illustrious ancestor. In the twenty-second year of his reign (counting from the date of his association with Hatshepsut) he invaded Palestine where the prince of Kadesh and his allies attempted vainly to withstand the Egyptian advance. The fame of this exploit reached the Assyrian king, who was not slow to turn it to his own account against his old foe Mitanni, and when the Egyptian king made a second thrust in his twenty-fourth year he was among the first to mark his friendliness to the conqueror with magnificent presents of lapis, gold and silver. His assessment of the potentialities of the Egyptian armies was justified. It was perhaps due to this diplomatic embassy from Assyria (with all the help and expectation it implied) that Thutmose crossed the Euphrates four years later and included Mitanni in his victorious advance (see pp. 73, 77).

Assyria had certainly impressed the Egyptian king favourably. According to a passage in a cuneiform letter sent by one Adad-nirari to a king of Egypt, it appears that his grandfather Taku had been appointed by Thutmose III or IV (called 'Manakhbiya') to be chief over the state of Nukhashshi. Taku, it is true, is not definitely an Assyrian name, but Adad-nirari is; so that although we cannot say that an Assyrian was appointed in the first instance, there are good grounds at all events for seeing an 'Assyrianizing'

tendency developing in the offspring; possibly from the maternal side. Within twenty years of the first expedition of Thutmose III Egyptian control extended as far as Aleppo and Carchemish, and friendly relations were opened by Egypt with the Chief of Sengara, doubtless the Sinjar Hills between the Euphrates and Tigris, now occupied by the Yezidis. By this time so high did the Egyptian reputation stand that even the Hittite kings were prepared to send gifts to the conquering Pharaoh.

Thus was the position of Assyria and Egypt at the dawn of the fifteenth century. Secure in the west, Assyria looked southwards to guard herself against the Kassites of Babylonia. It was Puzur-Ashur IV (1486-1460 B.C.) who was astute enough to come to an arrangement with Burna-Buriash I (1461-1436), making a treaty delimiting the frontiers between the two lands. From this time forth the Assyrians had little to fear from the Kassites; indeed, the Kassites, as far as we know, never really controlled this northern kingdom.

Puzur-Ashur is not known as yet for any military exploit. He was the first after Sharru-kin to restore the temple of Ishtar in Ashur, which had fallen into decay, probably as a result of the Mitanni raid; and he was also the first to girdle the 'New Town,' or southern quarter of Ashur, with a defensive wall. His successor, and perhaps son, was Enlil-našir (1459) of whom we know nothing; and as much may be said of the son of the latter, Ashur-rabi I (1440), and grandson, Ashur-nirari III (1425-1407).

Contemporary Kassite history is almost equally vague. Burna-Buriash I was succeeded probably by Kurigalzu II (1435-1411 B.C.), whose help was solicited by the 'Canaanites' against Egypt and as promptly refused. So, at least, we are told in the *ex parte* professions of loyalty made some half-century later by Burna-Buriash II in his letter to Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton) of Egypt. The Kassite king here reminds the Pharaoh that 'his father,' Kurigalzu, had been approached by the Kinakhkhi to join them in revolting against Egypt, but had returned answer that he would have no hand in annoying 'his brother,' the king of Egypt. These are the first relations between Kassite and Egyptian of which we know; otherwise the period of Kurigalzu II is a blank.

There were good reasons for the temporary eclipse of Assyria and Babylonia, for Egypt was continuing its brilliant Palestinian campaign. Amenhotep II (1447-1420) made an expedition into Syria, which, although it can hardly be regarded as a victorious march, so far affected Mitanni that the latter sought the favour of Egypt. Thutmose IV (1420-1411), recognizing the importance

of Mitanni, sought diplomatically to link the two kingdoms by a royal marriage, asking for the hand of the daughter of its king Artatama I, and, if the Mitanni version be true, had to ask seven times before she would consent. Mitanni was no pinchbeck kingdom at this time, for Artatama had made alliance with the Hittites; that the Egyptian king thus succeeded in connecting himself by marriage with Mitanni is evidence that Egypt was still regarded as a powerful factor west of the Euphrates in the second half of the fifteenth century B.C.

It was a fact recognized both by Kara-indash, the Kassite (1410-1401), who probably succeeded Kurigalzu II, and his contemporary Ashur-bēl-nishēshu of Assyria. No matter what feelings the two kings of the Tigris valley might bear to each other, they were ready at all costs to show a bold front to an external enemy. They were so nervous about Egypt, the coquette now flirting with Mitanni, that they followed the custom of their fathers in swearing an agreement together, ostensibly about their boundaries, but doubtless not without a possible defensive war in view. At home they set their house in order; the Assyrian king re-fortified the weak spots in the ramparts of his citadel at the 'New Town' of Ashur, and his brother, Ashur-rim-nishēshu, who succeeded him, carried on the work of fortification still further.

There was no real need. Amenhotep III (1411-1375), who succeeded Thutmose IV, sent his envoys to Kara-indash towards the end of the latter's reign (so we are told by Burna-Buriash II) in all friendliness. The young Egyptian king had no desire to extend his conquests east of the Euphrates or northwards into the mountains, for, even omitting all question of the dangerous length of his Palestinian empire, neither he nor his people from warm Egypt liked the winter snows of the highlands or muddy rains of the winter season in Naharain. The Euphrates with its broad stream, often a quarter of a mile across in the reaches at Carchemish, constituted an admirable boundary. Beyond that, he hoped for friends, not foes, and by his judicious matrimonial ventures welded the Near East into some kind of diplomatic harmony. Instead of echoing with the clash of arms and warlike raids, the roads of Palestine gave passage to peaceful pageants of kings' sisters and daughters, accompanied by hundreds of their maidens, travelling in state to royal nuptials. In the end we find one of these, the sister of Kadashman-Enlil I, probably the daughter of Kara-indash himself, going down to the harem of Amenhotep III; the Kassite king had learnt how groundless were his fears for the safety of Babylonia at the hands of Egypt.

Already married to the beautiful Tiy, perhaps a Mesopotamian, Amenhotep III had allied himself with Mitanni by marrying, in his tenth year (1401), its princess Gilukhipa, the daughter of Shuttarna, and subsequently he took her own niece, Tadukhipa, the daughter of Tushratta and granddaughter of Shuttarna, who came down to Egypt dowered with all possible presents that such a princess could wish, a full inventory of which has been left by careful scribes. Again, not content with marrying the sister of Kadashman-Enlil, the uxorious Egyptian sought also to wed the daughter, in accordance with a custom certainly at that time popular. In return he sent his own daughter abroad in marriage, the king of the little state Arzawa, by name Tarkhundaraush (or Tarkhundaraba), being thus honoured. Everywhere there was a reasonable peace; it was an easy period.

Friendly alike to Kassite and Assyrian king, Amenhotep sent presents to the latter, who was now building his palace in Ashur; what more opportune than twenty talents of gold for the more lavish decoration of its walls? Ashur-nadin-akhi (1396) was the favoured recipient of this gift, as Ashur-uballit tells us; he lived at peace on the Tigris, constructed his dwellings, dug his wells, and his son Eriba-Adad (1390) kept them in good order, and, when other amusements failed, made additions to the great temple E-Kharsag-kurkura, until his time came to depart from this world, when he was buried in the particular tomb (*bit sha pagri*), in the heart of the capital, of which the Broken Obelisk speaks. His successor Ashur-uballit (1386-1369) is said to have subdued Mušri and Shubarī. At one time he was in close correspondence with Amenhotep IV, at least so far as the Suti bedouin, who held the routes between the two lands, would permit, and one of his letters shows that he was in a position to ask for, if not to demand, twenty talents of gold from the Egyptian king. But Burna-Buriash II, the Kassite king (1395-1371), learnt of these *pourparlers*, and a jealous fear of Assyrian pre-eminence at the Egyptian court led him to urge a strong protest. He, too, had written frequently to Amenhotep IV, now hoping that friendship would continue between Egypt and Babylonia as it was in the days of Amenhotep III, and now making a request for gold, like Ashur-uballit, because he was building a temple, probably that of Enlil at Nippur. He had cemented the friendship between the two lands by the betrothal or marriage of his son with Amenhotep's daughter, who lived in Egypt at her father's court; and on one occasion he sent her a present of a necklet of 1048 beads, counting them with due caution lest unauthorized hands should

take their toll of them on its long journey. When, therefore, he heard of Ashur-uballiṭ's friendliness with Egypt, as we have said, he protested. The sting was in the tail of one of his letters: 'Now as for the Assyrians who are my dependents, I myself wrote to thee about them. Why have they come to thy land? If thou lovest me, they shall bring about no result; let them attain vanity only.' He left nothing to chance, however, and, an Assyrian princess, the daughter of Ashur-uballiṭ, by name Muballiṭat-sherūā (or -erūa), was sought by him in marriage, either for himself or much more probably for his son Kara-khardash¹.

She bore a son Kadashman-Kharbe, who in due time came to the Kassite throne (1369-1368 B.C.), and one of his exploits was to repress the bedouin tribes, the Suti roaming the western desert, who, as was mentioned above, had been in control of the road to Egypt from Assyria in Ashur-uballiṭ's time, so that the latter had feared, as he says, to send back the Egyptian envoys. Kadashman-Kharbe drove them back vigorously into their deserts, and established a chain of blockhouses with wells as a barrier against their inroads. Indeed, at a later time (at some period before the ninth century) so impudent did they become that they raided Sippar and burnt its temple to the Sun. The Shammar and Aneyzeh of modern times inherit their characteristics.

But civil war suddenly broke out in Babylonia, about 1368 B.C.; and the Kassite people, incited to revolution, murdered Kadashman-Kharbe and elected either Nazibugash or Shuzigash—there are two accounts—to the Kassite throne. The Chronicle 'P' says that this rebellion was 'after' Kadashman-Kharbe's energetic action against the Suti. We cannot say whether the Assyrian queen-mother was unpopular; but there was evidently a rising feeling against Assyria (as the letter of Burna-Buriash II to Ikhnaton shows), and it is more than probable that there was an anti-Assyrian party in Nippur who fanned the natural anger of the Suti against Kadashman-Kharbe into a blaze, so that these wild tribes were ready to help oust this half-breed Kassito-Assyrian from the throne. Moreover, by now the Egyptian control of Palestine and Syria was slipping from the lax hold of Ikhnaton, who thought more of his 'Sun-disk Movement' than

¹ The Chronicle known as 'P' calls the latter Kara-indash, but the Synchronic History is more probably right in giving the form Kara-khardash, since one of the new cuneiform tablets from Ashur is a letter directed to Kara-khardash and a princess, and is probably the draft of a letter of Ashur-uballiṭ to this son-in-law and daughter (*K.A.H.*, 1920, No. 97).

of statesmanship; and it may be that the Kassite people, perhaps displeased at the 'Egyptianizing' tendency of their Royal Line as a form of copying or truckling to Assyria, seized the opportunity of bringing it to an end.

Ashur-uballiṭ, still on the Assyrian throne, although by no means a young man, had no hesitation about acting vigorously on behalf of his grandson. He led or sent an expedition down against the usurper and overthrew his party, who were not strong enough to withstand the Assyrian forces. If they had expected any aid from the Suti, they should have known better than to rely on such tribesmen for persistent or difficult effort. The wheel of Fortune turned again: the usurper was killed and the Assyrian king left the government of the country in the hands of his great-grandson Kurigalzu III, who can hardly have been more than a child when the revolt took place, and must have been lucky to escape being murdered.

There is no reason to suppose that Kurigalzu was a baby when he came to the throne; *ṣikḫru*, as he was called, means in general 'young,' and may well signify a boy here. If we reckon that Ashur-uballiṭ was seventeen when his daughter Muballiṭat-(sh)erūa was born, and that she was sixteen when she bore Kadashman-Kharbe, who in his turn may have been only seventeen at the birth of Kurigalzu, Ashur-uballiṭ's age need not have been more than fifty when his great-grandson was born; and if Kurigalzu III was fifteen when he was on the throne, the Assyrian king need have been only sixty-five when he championed his cause. The curious point is that we cannot in fact assign a very long reign to Ashur-uballiṭ: the new Ashur synchronisms seem to show that he was a contemporary of the latter part of the reign of Burna-Buriash II, and that before Kurigalzu was dead or deposed he had been succeeded by Enlil-nirari.

We do not know if Elam had any hand in the revolt, but the first activity of Kurigalzu III was to lead a campaign against its king Khurbatilla. So successful was he that he took the Elamite king prisoner at Dur-Dungi, and captured large booty; but unhappily contemporaneous events in remote lands made themselves felt in his kingdom, and nullified the advantage he had gained over his neighbour.

It fell out in this way. Ikhnaton was nearing the end of his reign, and his Asiatic provinces were seething with revolt. The reiterated and pathetic appeals from his loyal governors in Asia for help against the rebels fell on deaf ears and in the end the rebels threw off the Egyptian yoke (see pp. 302 *seqq.*). With this

gradual decadence of Egypt had come a corresponding Hittite rise. Shubbiluliuma, the Hittite king (c. 1411-1359), was bound by treaty with Egypt, but it was probably not from any love which he bore to her, for the Hittite and Egyptian royal houses were not yet inter-related by marriage, and we may reasonably consider that the great Syrian revolt against Egypt was a source of satisfaction to the Hittites, even if it were not actually fomented by them. When, therefore, as one of the Amarna letters seems to imply (No. LXXXVI), Mitanni, probably under Tushratta (c. 1399-1360), attempted to help the Egyptians by trying—and unsuccessfully—to relieve Simyra on the Phoenician coast, the key to the military situation, the Hittite king was naturally displeased. Whether it was *post hoc* or *propter hoc* we do not know, but Shubbiluliuma invaded Mitanni and brought the neighbouring land of Ishuwa under his control. There was an *émeute* in Mitanni, and Tushratta was murdered by his son Artatama: his elder brother had met with a similar fate (p. 301).

It was the moment for Assyria. 'The land of Mitanni was ruined; the men of Assyria and Alshe divided it.' Alshe, doubtless the Alzi of Tiglath-pileser I, must have been a neighbour of both Assyria and Mitanni. The north and west were now harmless against Assyria, and it was a favourable opportunity to deal with the southern Kassite kingdom. Enlil-nirari, the Assyrian king (1368-1346) was quick to seize it. He led an expedition against Kurigalzu III and the two armies encountered each other at Sugagi (or Zugagi) on the Tigris; the Assyrian king utterly routed Kurigalzu, and then altered the frontier line between the two countries to suit his own ideas. His success was definite; it is recorded in both Chronicles, and it is mentioned as a heroic tradition in an inscription of his grandson, Adad-nirari I: 'Enlil-nirari, the priest of Ashur, who destroyed the army of the Kassites, whose hand overcame all his enemies, who enlarged boundary and border.' There is even a fleeting reference to the war on a 'boundary stone' (*kudurru*) of the time of Kashtiliash III, found at Susa; 'during the war (*siltu*) with Shubartu Kurigalzu saw it' (*i.e.* a certain parcel of land).

Artatama II on the throne of Mitanni apparently welcomed the Assyrians. But there was obviously a hostile faction in this country ready to put on the throne Mattiuaza, the son of Tushratta. The prime movers were the Harri, and Mattiuaza was driven forth by Shutarna, Artatama's son, lest he should seize the kingdom. Shutarna curried favour with Assyria by restoring the doors of silver and gold which had been carried off by

Shaushshatar in his raid; he treated the **Harri** with such severity that they fled to the Kassites. But the Kassite king was not inclined to anger the Assyrians again, and he promptly distrained on the fugitives, seizing their property and two hundred chariots. Mitanni was by now in woeful plight; the inhabitants were starving.

It was then that the Hittite king **Shubbiluliuma** came to the rescue, alive to the advantage of having a friend and not an enemy as ruler over Mitanni. 'In order that the land of Mitanni, the great land, might not disappear,' the great king **Shubbiluliuma** sent practical relief in the form of food; he drove out the Assyrians and the men of **Alshe**; he put **Mattiuaza** on this throne and gave him his daughter in marriage. Yet what he feared came to pass presently, for the very name Mitanni died out of cuneiform records, although it may perhaps survive in the modern **Metina**, a name for a mountainous district a day's march north-west from **Mardin**¹.

By this time, at the death of **Ikhnoton** (1358), Egypt had lost Palestine and Syria. The Hittite king who had driven the Assyrians out of Mitanni had laid secure foundations for his two sons, **Arnuwandash II** (1358-1356) and **Murshil II** (1355-1330); the powerful **Amurru** were their friends, and **Murshil** did not forget their help when he ousted a usurping dynasty from the old **Amurru** (Amorite) possession of **Bargā**, south of **Aleppo**. But Assyria was not affected by such a small set-back: **Enlil-nirari's** son **Arik-dēn-ilu** (1345-1306), if negative evidence counts for anything, was too strong to be attacked by his contemporaries on the Kassite throne (**Burna-Buriash III** [?], **Kurigalzu IV** [?] and **Nazi-Maruttash II**) and, from what his son **Adad-nirari** tells us, he was free for vigorous thrusts elsewhere. With the Kassites still feeling the effects of their defeat, he was able to consolidate his empire from the Persian border on the east to **Commagene** on the west. His first expedition against the **Yashubakula** (probably the **Yasubigalla** of **Sennacherib**), was completely successful, although they had put seven thousand men in the field. Then he conquered **Nigimti**, besieged the city **Arnuni**, and apparently slew the hostile commander, **Esini**, who had thirty-three chariots at his command. **Turuki**, probably near the Persian frontier, and **Kuti**, east of the **Lesser Zab**, must be included in his eastern successes; **Kutmukh**, and even the tribes of the **Akhlamū** and **Sutū**, always troublesome in the western deserts, mark his western exploits.

The old smouldering hostility between the Kassites and Assyrians

¹ See Kiepert's map illustrating von Oppenheim's *Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf*.

broke again into flame in the time of Adad-nirari I (1305-1277), and one of the early successes of the latter king was when he defeated Nazi-Maruttash II at 'Kar-Ishtar of Akarsallu.' The old frontier was again altered, running now from the land of Pilaski on the far side of the Tigris, from Arman-akarsali to Lulumē (east of Khanikin). Not without reason did he claim to be 'the destroyer of the mighty hosts of the Kassites.'

Secure in the south, the Assyrian king was able to expand his empire in the north. He claims to have trampled down the lands of his foes 'from Lupdu and Rapiḫu to Elukhat,' giving the names of the towns he captured in detail; his domain now spread from the hills of Persia to the fertile red lands of Harran, as far as Carchemish. As yet so far and no farther: this is the old western Mitanni boundary, and beyond it he would meet the Hittites, a power which he was not yet strong enough to overthrow. During his warfare in the north he left behind him, perhaps in dedication, the bronze scimitar inscribed with his name which is said to have been found at Mardīn or Diarbēkr. Yet although he might not meet the Hittites in the field, his fame had reached them, as is testified by a fragment of a letter found at Boghaz Keui, with its phrase 'your lord, Adad-nirari.' In fact, there was a very distinct line of cleavage between the Tigris valley and the Hittites; the boundary between them was the Euphrates, and we do not find *rencontres* frequent. Now was beginning the period of the XIXth Dynasty (see chap. VII), during which there were famous wars and treaties between Egypt and the Hittites, which directly concern Assyria little or not at all. Finally, after a hundred years more, the great Hittite dynasty was to fall out of the political horizon at the death of Dudkhaliash III. Murshil II (1355-1330) apparently never pushed east of the Euphrates; Carchemish, and Gashgash (the Kashkā of Tiglath-pileser I) to the north of Commagene represented his eastern boundaries. He and the Assyrian glared at each other across the River, without venturing to dispute possession; but the Assyrian empire had at last reached the Euphrates.

The Hittite throne went first to Mutallu (1329-1290), the eldest son of Murshil, and then the second son Hattushil (1289-1256?), who was fully alive to the advantage of Kassite hostility against Assyria. He was in correspondence with the successor to Nazi-Maruttash II, Kadashman-Turgu (1293-1277), with whom he made a treaty of alliance. So long as Assyria was threatened even a little in the south, she would find ample scope for her northern activities east of the Euphrates without taking responsi-

bilities farther west. No Hittite king would now consider himself justified in campaigning in Palestine with his left flank exposed to hostility from the Assyrian side of the River, and all the records show how carefully Murshil, Mutallu and Hattushil secured themselves by friendship with the kinglets of Bargā, Aleppo, Carchemish, Arvad and Kadesh, and the powerful Amurrū, even intermarrying with the latter about the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The Syrian princes thoroughly understood the virtue of combination, and were as ready to band themselves together now, just as they did later against Shalmaneser III in the ninth century.

With the death of Kadashman-Turgu (1277) Babylonia seethed with discontent. There must have been some faction hostile to the ruling king (possibly with pro-Assyrian tendencies), for Hattushil wrote to the notables of Karduniash threatening hostility if they did not accept Kadashman-Turgu's son, Kadashman-Enlil, as their king, but, on the other hand, promising active help in war (that is, of course, against Assyria) if they concurred. He also reminds the young king that even Itti-Marduk-balaṭu, Kadashman-Enlil's own minister, had repudiated any external championship on his behalf. One remark which he made reiterates the usual difficulty of communication between the two countries; this time it is the Akhlamū, the wild tribes of Babylonia, who had been the cause of delay in negotiations.

II. THE EMERGENCE OF ASSYRIA

The accession of Shalmaneser I (1276-1257) to the throne of Assyria came at the period when the Hittite-Egyptian wars were ending and the Great Treaty between Hattushil and Ramses II was about to be made (1266). The monument of this Assyrian king, found lately at Ashur, indicates the rapid advance of Assyrian power, for it shows how his first exploit was to invade the north, including Uruadri (*i.e.* Urartu, Armenia) and the lands of Khimme, Uadkun, Bargun, Salua, Khalila, Lukha, Nilipakhri, and Zingun, which he subdued after three days' hard fighting, and made to pay tribute. Khimme and Lukha we meet again in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I (1115-1103), for they sent aid to the people of 'Sugi, which is in the land of Kirkhi.'

The Hittite power was waning. Shalmaneser marched to 'the city of Arina a strongly-fortified mountain,' which had revolted 'despising the god Ashur'; and he destroyed it, sprinkling ~~the~~ *time* ('ashes') thereon. Having, as his inscription says, brought

all Mušri, or part of Cappadocia, into subjection, the king continued his victorious campaign by invading Ḫani (*i.e.* Hani-galbat). Its king, Shattūra (whose name is reminiscent of Shaushshatar, Shuttarna and Shutatarra of Mitanni in the preceding centuries) brought to his aid the Hittites and the Akhlamū, and, by cutting off the water which the Assyrian army drank, was nearly successful. But Shalmaneser was too clever for him, for, apparently by mere weight of numbers, he defeated his foe and took fourteen thousand four hundred prisoners. After that, he invaded the highlands 'from the city Taïdi to the city Irridi,' the whole of the mountains of Kashiari, as far as Elukhat, Sūdi and Harran as far as Carchemish. Clearly the Assyrians regarded the inhabitants of the mountains to the north as more easily subdued than those of the plains; doubtless intercourse was far more difficult between villages in the mountains than between those on more level ground, and the Assyrian soldiery were able to deal piecemeal with an enemy in the highlands more successfully than they could have hoped to do in the open.

On the other hand, the Kassites must have been a thorn in the side of the Assyrian king, for his expeditions, as far as we know, extended only west, north and east. He was able to subdue the Kūtī to the east, but he left the Kassites alone, and it was not until the next reign that the southern kingdom was attacked, when Ḫattushil was no longer able to promise his aid. Even then, although they thus became an easy mark for Assyria, the conquest was only for a few years.

Shalmaneser in his less warlike moments found time to rebuild the great temple of Ashur, E-Kharsag-kurkura. Originally founded by Ushpia, who, besides being ruler was also priest of the god, it had fallen into ruin, and Erishu restored it; again it decayed and Shamshi-Adad renewed it. Then five hundred and eighty years later, in the time of Shalmaneser, the ancient temple caught fire and was burnt to the ground, and with loving care Shalmaneser rebuilt the whole of it, in a manner befitting the dignity of Ashur.

His son Tukulti-Ninurta (1256-1233) was a worthy successor. Before dealing with the Kassites, one of his first works was to continue his father's consolidation in the north-west across the lands of Na'iri to Commagene, and subsequently to Māri, Ḫana and Rapiku. He transplanted 28,800 of the people of Hatti to the east of the Euphrates; he fought with forty-three kings of Na'iri and defeated them; and subdued 'all the broad lands of Shubari,' including Alzi and Purukhumzi, which must be the Purukuzzi of

later texts. There exists a curious little detail in confirmation of his invasion. An inscription found at Susa shows that a certain Agabtakha fled for refuge from Hanigalbat to Kashtiliash III (1249-1242)—not, be it noted, to the Hittites, but to Babylonia—and here he continued his trade of leather-worker, so common in the districts of the Upper Euphrates where the dwarf oaks used in tanning are plentiful. Clearly Tukulti-Ninurta's campaign had made itself felt in Hanigalbat.

But most striking of all Tukulti-Ninurta's exploits was his overthrow of the Kassite power. Kadashman-Enlil II had been succeeded by Kudur-Enlil (1270-1263), of whom we know little more than that he was father of Shagarakti-Shuriash (1262-1250), who, according to Nabonidus, rebuilt a temple in Sippar. The *débaclé* came after the latter's death, when Kashtiliash III had come to the throne. The Hittites were no longer powerful to aid, nor were they concerned further with Syria. Now was the time to wipe off old scores. Tukulti-Ninurta challenged an issue. 'At the head of my warriors they (*i.e.* the gods?) marched.' He fought Kashtiliash III (1249-1242), defeated him and took him prisoner. He destroyed the ramparts of Babylon and killed many of the inhabitants; and among the booty which he carried off to Assyria was the statue of Marduk, doubtless out of E-Sagila, and a signet of the preceding king Shagarakti-Shuriash. So thorough was his conquest that he governed the country for seven years, actually appointing Assyrian governors. He retired to Assyria to build himself a new capital, Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, and boast that he was 'king of Ashur and Karduniash, of Sumer and Akkad, of Sippar and Babylon, of Dilmun and Melu-khkha¹.'

His rule over his new province was disastrous. The first governor appointed over the Kassites was a native Assyrian, Enlil-nadin-shum, and it is obvious that his office was no sinecure. Hardly had he taken up the reins of power when the Elamite army, ready to take advantage of any diversion, swept down on him under the king, Kidin-Khutrutash, and sacked Nippur and Dēr. This was too much for the Assyrian king, and Enlil-nadin-shum abruptly ceased to govern the Kassites—'ended his rule,' as

¹ An inscription found at Susa states that Untash-Gal, son of Khubanumena, king of Anzan, carried off Immiriya, the god of Kashtiliash, and put it in Siyankuk (Scheil, *Délég. en Perse*, x, 85). If this be Kashtiliash III, we have to include an Elamite invasion of Babylonia probably coincident with the success of the Assyrian arms. Scheil, however, is inclined on geographical grounds to think of Kashtiliash I.

the Assyrian historian puts it. His rule lasted no more than eighteen months (1241), and it is not improbable that when he was relieved of his office he was made governor of Nippur. At least, a man of this name governed Nippur in the time of Adad-shum-iddin. A Kassite, Kadashman-Kharbe II (1240-1239), was diplomatically chosen to succeed him, and after an equally short tenure he was succeeded by Adad-shum-iddin, who ruled for six years (1238-1233). Then came an upheaval, a revolution in Assyria. If we are to believe the statement that the Assyrians governed Babylonia for only seven years this revolt must have occurred about 1233. The nobles of Akkad and Karduniash intrigued with Ashur-nadin (*or* *našir*)-apli, the son of Tukulti-Ninurta of Assyria, and raised the standard of rebellion. The old Assyrian king was trapped in his new capital, besieged and murdered by his son.

Exactly when in Adad-shum-iddin's reign the Elamites made a second raid we do not know: but Kidin-Khutrutash again attacked Babylonia, reaching Ishin. It is probable that it was in one of these expeditions that two 'knobs' (or phalli) discovered at Susa were carried off; one had been devoted to Enlil by Kurigalzu II (?), son of Burna-Buriash I (?), and the other by Shagarakti-Shuriash. An agate scaraboid dedicated to Kadi by Kurigalzu met the same fate. As Father Scheil suggests, the love of souvenir-collecting was as prevalent then as now.

Of Tukulti-Ninurta's son Ashur-nadin-apli we know nothing except that he murdered his father. After his reign Ashur-nirari III came to the throne (1213-1208), and we find the king of Karduniash, Adad-shum-našir (1232-1203), writing to Ashur-nirari ('Ashur-narara') curiously enough with one Nabu-dayani as joint kings of Assyria¹. A late copy of this letter (K. 3045) is extant; it is modelled on the form of Hammurabi's letters, and, it must be admitted, is not friendly in tone, but goes so far as to speak of the mad counsels of the two Assyrian kings. We must therefore assume a rising hostility between the two countries, which came to a head when the next Assyrian king, Enlil-kudur-ušur (1207-1203), again challenged the Kassite power and fought Adad-shum-našir. Both these latter kings appear to have been killed, and Ninurta-apal-ekur, the next king (1202-1176), who was possibly not Enlil-kudur-ušur's son, but perhaps a descendant of Eriba-Adad, carried on the war, but returned to

¹ The text, Weidner, *M.D.V.G.* 1921, p. 14, makes Ashur-nirari a contemporary of Adad-shum-iddin (and not of Adad-shum-našir), which is shown by this letter to be obviously impossible.

Assyria, apparently so hard-pressed that he had to reinforce his army with reserves. The Synchronous History is broken at this point, but it would appear that the new king of Babylonia, Meli-Shipak II (1202-1188), pursued him in an attempt to conquer Assyria, but was defeated and driven back into his own land. A few years' peace intervened, and then the armies of the two nations met again. Meli-Shipak II¹ had been succeeded by his son Marduk-apal-iddin (1187-1175) and he by Ilbaba-shum-iddin (1174). Ashur-dān I (1175-1141) had replaced Ninurta-apal-ekur. In 1174 the Assyrian king attacked Karduniash, and captured the towns of Zaban, Irriya and Akarsallu, doubtless near the frontier, and carried off their booty to Assyria. Worse followed: the Elamites seized their opportunity, swept down from the mountains under Shutruk-Nakhkhunte and slew Ilbaba-shum-iddin, and the Elamite king with his son Kutir-nakhkhunte sacked Sippar. It was the end of Kassite dominion; one more king ascended the throne, Enlil-nadin-akhe (1173-1169), the Kassite dynasty fell, and then arose a new power in Babylonia, the 'Pashē' dynasty.

So came to an end the great Kassite dynasty which had included thirty-six kings and endured for 576 years 9 months. That they were not entirely eliminated we may possibly infer from a bombastic title, 'spoiler of the Kassites,' which Nebuchadrezzar I, the third king of the Pashē dynasty, gives himself. But in any case they must have been powerless. This long period is not marked by any salient advance either in literature, art or conquest, and there is little to show that the people had any capacity for invention or poetry. They introduced a new system of dating, and brought in the horse. Their kings were alert to the importance of securing the goodwill of the people, and, with the double intention of conferring benefits on the great land-owners, and of winning their loyalty, they bestowed large estates on those who served them. Kurigalzu III, for instance, in his brief reign gave a parcel of land to one Enlil-bani, a priest of Enlil, the patron-god of Nippur, whose worship the Kassites adopted. This grant was reaffirmed to the descendants by a successor, Kadashman-Enlil, that is, at a period subsequent to Enlil-nirari's defeat of the Kassites; and it may be that such a catastrophe intervened to annul such rights. Grants of this nature are frequent on the so-called 'boundary stones' (*kudurrus*).

¹ We know the name of his daughter Khunnubat-Nanā, who was probably a priestess. She is portrayed wearing a long robe from her neck to her ankles, holding a harp (Scheil, *Défig.* x, pl. 13).

Equally the Kassites accepted the religion of Babylonia, although the names of their ancient gods appear in their personal names. Almost all the deities invoked in the *kudurru* ('boundary stones') are the familiar Mesopotamian powers, and at the same time such native deities as Shukamuna and Shumalia, 'the queen of the snowy heights' of the Persian border, as well as Tishpak of Dēr, occur side by side with them. Ignorant of writing, the invaders had adopted cuneiform and learnt the Babylonian tongue. The Temple at Nippur was not only a depository for temple-archives, but had also a school attached, as the numerous 'practice-tablets' discovered by the American expedition show. It was held in high veneration, the very kings themselves at this period being the chief administrators. The officials of the land are many and various. Among the most important is the *guenna*, responsible to the king, with a large staff of administrative clerks; for example, on a boundary stone (No. III, published by L. W. King) Enlil-nadinshum is *guenna* of Nippur. The *bēl-pakhāti* appears to be a provincial governor. The *shakin* is over the larger towns, such as Babylon or Ishin (Isin), or even the little known Ushti, or even a district, Namar; and the *khazannu*, the mayor of a town or village, is doubtless equivalent to the modern *agha* or even higher. The *sukkallu* was still in existence (there was a *sukkallu širu*); the once supreme *patesi* is now only a king's officer known by the title *shak sharri*.

The Kassite dress of this period is doubtless very much the same as that which we find two centuries later. Duri-ulmash, the son of a Kurigalzu, who can hardly be later than the fourteenth century, is represented on his seal as wearing a long robe. Before Kurigalzu III, judging from a *kudurru* of which the inscription had been rubbed out in his time, the long robe was the customary dress, and the flounced dress in which a goddess is portrayed is reminiscent of Sumer, and may perhaps not represent what the Kassite women wore. Men retained their beards at this time and onwards: on a poorly sculptured *kudurru* of Meli-Shipak the god, who wears a fringed and flounced robe with a high *calathus*-like headdress, is bearded and his hair is long. A hundred years later a king, probably of the IInd Dynasty of Isin, is attired in much the same way: his beard and hair are royally combed and oiled and he wears a long, richly-decorated robe with sleeves to the elbows, girt about with cross-belt and waistbelt; on his head is the same *calathus*-like headdress decorated with feathers, and on his feet are shoes. The weapons customary at this time are the mace, the dagger, and bows and arrows.

Princesses, as is shown in the portrait of Khunnubat-Nanā, wore long robes.

We have a picture of a private citizen in Babylonia on one of the *kudurru*s of about 1000 B.C. A certain Arad-Sibitti lived in or near the village of Sha-mamitu, which also boasted a jeweller, by name Burusha; and one day the former, for reasons unknown to us, flew into a passion with Burusha's unfortunate slave-girl and killed her. The murderer was haled before the royal courts at Kar-Marduk, and his trial was a *cause célèbre*, at which many notables were present. He pleaded his cause so well that the king condemned him merely to pay Burusha sevenfold, seven slaves, which he did. The record of the trial mentions that one of these slaves was practically decrepit; but doubtless one of the blemishes in Arad-Sibitti's character shines out in his scribe's description of him here, just as others do in the unflattering portrait by the sculptor. In the fulness of time Arad-Sibitti's daughter Sag-mudammik-sharbe grew up, and Burusha's son cast eyes upon her, and—in spite of the old feud—the families were united by the marriage of these two, and then it was that all the relations marked their appreciation of the reconciliation by lavish wedding presents in land and kind. We can see how they dressed at this time: the truculent Arad-Sibitti is portrayed as rather a common-looking person, with a long nose and unkempt beard and hair (indeed the artist, doubtless unintentionally, has suggested that date-wine was not unknown to him). He wears a long robe from neck to ankles, belted at the waist; like the modern inhabitant of the Near East, he must be shown holding his weapons, a bow and arrows. On his feet are sandals. His sister, who follows him meekly, is more pleasing to the eyes; her buxom figure is draped in a long dress, and her feet, as befits a housewife in these muddy villages, appear to be encased in sabots.

The new dynasty of Babylonia, called Pashē, and accepted as the IInd Dynasty of Isin, consisted of eleven kings and lasted for 132 years 6 months. The kings appear to be all native Babylonians, and among them is the name of at least one famous man, Nebuchadrezzar I.

The first king, Marduk-shapik-zeri (c. 1169–1153), came to the throne during the reign of Ashur-dān I, who had defeated Ilbaba-shum-iddin the Kassite three or four years before. Neither he nor his successor, Ninurta-nadin-shum (1152–1147), have left us sufficient record of their doings. The Assyrian king, Ashur-dān, died, or perhaps was murdered in 1141; there is great probability that his successor, Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur (1140–

1138), was a usurper, since Ashur-rēsh-ishi and Tiglath-pileser I sternly omit him in their respective genealogical trees between Ashur-dān and the unimportant Mutakkil-Nusku. Indeed, a little additional colouring is given to this by an unintelligible broken line between Marduk-shapik-zeri and Ninurta-nadin-shum, in the new list, which evidently conceals some historical fact about Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur, who here is made contemporary with Marduk-shapik-zeri¹. He was certainly a troublesome king, for we find on an ancient letter, which mentions also a Kassite Kharbi-Shipak ('a Khabirra') that he was an active enemy against one Ashur-shum-lishir, possibly a ruler in Assyria. So great were the ravages committed that Ashur-shum-lishir fled for refuge to the king of Babylonia, who treated him with honour, and later on sent him home. Indeed, it was a time of misfortune for Assyria, for Tiglath-pileser relates that about 1160 or 1170 the Mushkai (Moschi, Meshech) had overrun Alzi and Purukuzzi, which at this time were within the Assyrian dominion, as they had been since the time of Tukulti-Ninurta. See p. 274.

Ninurta-nadin-shum was succeeded by a king with a great name, Nebuchadrezzar I (1146-1123). Two serious wars was Nebuchadrezzar compelled to wage, one against Elam and the other against Assyria, the latter doubtless arising out of the incident mentioned above. In the former he was successful; in the latter campaign he was finally defeated. He would appear also to have fought other campaigns, since he calls himself the subduer of Amurru, the lands of the Middle Euphrates, and 'the hero... who overthrew the mighty Lullubi.'

The Elamites, possibly under Shilhak-In-Shushinak, invaded the land and carried terror with them. There was no withstanding them; the Babylonian troops met them in battle near the headwaters of the Uknī river in the south or south-east, and were soundly beaten, and retired on Dur-Apil-Sin. Nebuchadrezzar, driven back still further to Babylon, could but appeal to Marduk: 'How long, O Lord of Babylon, wilt thou dwell in the land of the enemy?' Fugitives had come in for sanctuary from all sides; it was the moment for a final effort, and Nebuchadrezzar made it. In the middle of summer, in Tammuz, when the thermometer rises to 120° F., or, as the cuneiform account says, 'the axehead burnt like fire and the *mu[ka]*t of the roads scorched like flame,' Nebuchadrezzar went forth to war, and marched for more than two hundred miles from the city of Dēr, with his chariot-master

¹ On fragment D of Weidner (*M.D.F.G.* 1915, p. 3) he is a contemporary of Nebuchadrezzar I.

Ritti-Marduk at his right hand. There were only rare watering-places on the road, and the army reached the river Eulaeus tormented by heat and thirst, where the opposing forces confronted each other. A duststorm arose, so that neither could see the other; the Elamites (who perhaps had left their cooler mountains in ignorance of the inferno which awaited them on the flat deserts below) were driven back to their mountains, and Nebuchadrezzar plundered their land.

So pleased was he with the conduct of Ritti-Marduk that he made him the recipient of special favours, and granted concessions to his native town of Bit-Karziabku. Similarly he befriended two fugitives, Shamūa and Shamai, of a priestly family from Dīn-Sharri, and brought their god Ria into Babylon and established it in a shrine in the village of Khuṣṣi, which was near Bit-Sin-asharidu, on the bank of the Takkiru canal.

But he failed signally in his campaign against Assyria. The Assyrian king, Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur, had been succeeded by Mutakkil-Nusku (1137-1128) and then by Ashur-rēsh-ishi I (1127-1116); the new Assyrian monarch was vigorous and energetic, and to his credit we must place the suppression of the Akhlamū, those nomads on the south-west, and a conquest of Lullumē (Sir-i-pul) on the east. He was a man capable of dealing effectively with Nebuchadrezzar, and he promptly stopped the latter's inroads. Nebuchadrezzar tried conclusions in battle with him and was routed; he was driven back home with the loss of forty chariots and his army commander. It was doubtless not long after this defeat that Nebuchadrezzar died, and was succeeded by his son Enlil-nadin-apli (1122-1117).

We have now reached a period when Assyria is to dominate by sheer force the lands of the Two Rivers. Enlil-nadin-apli was succeeded in Babylonia by Marduk-nadin-akhē (1116-1101); Tiglath-pileser came to the Assyrian throne about 1115, where he remained for thirteen years¹.

Everywhere among the surrounding nations was decadence. Egypt, with the later Ramessids, was nearing its fall. The Hittite empire had been engulfed at the beginning of the twelfth century by the hordes from the west, of which we have already heard an echo as far east as Alzi and Purukuzzi, on the old north-west confines of Assyria, which the Moschi had captured about 1170-1160.

Babylonia was governed by a dynasty which was rapidly to become weak, and be followed by equally ineffective groups of

¹ On the chronology see the Appendix.

kings 'of the sea-lands,' 'of Bazi,' and the like. It was the opportunity for a vigorous Assyrian to display his prowess, to enlarge his boundaries of his country; and Tiglath-pileser took it.

His first exploit was to regain the revolted provinces of Alzi and Purukuzzi which had for fifty years been under control of the Moschi. So impudent had these latter become that five of their kings with an army of twenty thousand set forth against Kummukh (Commagene) about 1115, and Tiglath-pileser hastened valiantly to meet this invasion of his outlying provinces. 'By the help of Ashur, my lord,' he says, 'I gathered my war-chariots and assembled my troops; I delayed not, but crossed Kashiari (the Karaja Dagħ), a rugged land. With their twenty thousand men and their five kings I fought in Commagene and defeated them.' He slew many, cut off the heads of the corpses and piled them in heaps, and carried back six thousand as prisoners to Assyria.

Commagene, however, appears not to have been grateful. Hardly had Tiglath-pileser destroyed the enemy's forces when Commagene flaunted its refusal to pay the Assyrian taxes. The Assyrian king showed them that they could take no liberties; he carried fire and sword through their land, so that the inhabitants fled to Sherishe across the Tigris, making alliance with the Kurṭi. A bloody fight followed; their king Kili-Teshub, the son of Kali-Teshub, who was also called Sarupi (or Irrupi), was captured, with a large booty. So terrifying was the news that the inhabitants of the fortress of Urrakhinash in the Panari mountains, taking their gods with them, fled, and their king Shadi-Teshub, the son of Ḫatushar, surrendered himself. The personal names, so obviously Hittite, show that Tiglath-pileser had to deal with descendants of the Hittite kings.

Other countries in the neighbourhood were subdued: Mildish, near Mount Aruma, Shubari, and again the recalcitrant Alzi and Purukuzzi. Then the king dealt with the outlying portions of what had once been the Hittite empire, four thousand men of Kashkai (another text has the variant Abeshlaya) and Urumā in Shubartu, 'soldiers of the land of Hatti.' The Kashkai we have already seen were included in the eastern boundary of the Hittite king Murshil II (1355-1330), but their former lords were powerless to help now. Their hearts turned to water and they submitted tamely, and Tiglath-pileser went home with large booty including 120 chariots or wagons.

Yet for all his expeditions in these districts the fear of Assyria was still transient here. Commagene again proved troublesome; Tiglath-pileser once more sent a punitive expedition thither, and,

as usual, the mountaineers took to their mountain fastnesses where he could not touch them. Now it was the Kurṭi at the mountain Azu, where he conquered twenty-five cities at the foot of the mountains, which included the lands of Arzanibiu (*i.e.* Arzaniwiu = Arzanene); then the lands of Adaush, Saraush and Ammaush, near the mountain Aruma, the lands of Isua and Daria—all gave trouble. Many of them surrendered at discretion, for very fear of the great freebooter. It was hardly likely that the scattered mountain villages could resist a well-ordered expedition. They yielded with their tongues in their cheeks, ready to break out again in due time.

Leaving the northern and western districts he went south-east, crossing the Lower Zab against the lands of Maruttash and Saradaush, 'which are in the mountains of Asaniu and Aṭuma,' and conquered them. But again the north broke out, the indefatigable Kurṭi revolted; and finally he fought with twenty-three kings of the land of Na'iri and their allies. It is the north and west, always the north and west, which allow him no respite; Milidia (Malatia) in Hanigalbat, Carchemish, Mount Bishri (west of Carchemish), the very fringe of the old Hittite empire, to Muṣri (Cappadocia) with its city Arina and Ḳumanī, identified with Comana of Cataonia. Altogether, as he sums up, from the beginning of his rule to the fifth year, he subdued and included in his realm forty-two countries from the other side of the Zab to the other side of the Euphrates. He left a portrait of himself graven in the rock at the Sebenneh-Su in Na'iri. One of his greatest exploits was to campaign along the sea-coast of the Mediterranean: he took toll of the cedars of Lebanon for his buildings, exacted tribute from Gebal (Byblus), Sidon and Arvad, and in 'ships of Arvad' made a voyage of 'three land *bēru*' (about 21 miles) to Simyra, killing a *nakhiru* ('which they call a horse of the sea') on the way. In a subsequent foray in the west among his tributaries were the cities of Tadmār (Tadmor, Palmyra) and Anat (Anah). One of the rock-sculptures at Nahr el-Kelb in Phœnicia, which is now so worn that its maker is doubtful, may perhaps be his work.

As befitted a great conqueror, he was a mighty hunter, and the plains of the Khabur, the affluent of the Euphrates, yielded him trophy of elephants, while near Araziki (the classical Eragiza) he slew wild bulls; perhaps he is romancing when he says that he killed a hundred and twenty lions on foot, and eight hundred from his chariot. He was also a great architect; he rebuilt the temples of Ishtar, Martu and of Bēl 'the older,' of Anu and Adad,

and he renewed the palaces. Above all did he cherish his land, for he proudly records that he repaired all the water-machines throughout the land, and accumulated stores of grain. His conquests had vastly increased the cattle, sheep, horses and asses, and he had even seen to the breeding of wild deer and ibex which he had captured; his gardens and parks were adorned with strange trees and fruits from foreign lands. It was doubtless in full appreciation of his passion for collecting strange animals that the king of Egypt sent him a crocodile (p. 194). Such a bizarre gift would surely soften the heart of a great conqueror who had the strength to press so far into the Syrian arena. In a word, he was an admirable Oriental despot of the best kind.

He crossed swords with the Babylonian king, Marduk-nadin-akhē (c. 1116-1101), towards the end of his reign. If we may infer anything from a statement of Sennacherib, it was about the year 1107 B.C. that Marduk-nadin-akhē, the king of Babylon, made a raid on Assyria, and carried off the statues of the two deities, Adad and Shala. The Synchronous History then relates that 'a second time' the armies met, this time near Arzukhina on the Lower Zab, and 'in the second year' they fought at Marrite in Upper Akkad. The Assyrian king was victorious and then pressed into Babylonia, capturing Dur-Kurigalzu, the two Sipars, Babylon and Opis; and then plundered the land from Akarsallu to Lubdi, Sukhi and to Rapiḫi.

With the close of the twelfth century B.C. and the end of Tiglath-pileser's reign this chapter may conveniently break off. Mesopotamian history becomes obscure, and what little has to be said will be the natural prelude to the period dealt with in the next volume.

CHAPTER XI

THE HITTITES OF ASIA MINOR

I. NAME, DISTRIBUTION, SOURCES

A RACE, social group, polity or civilization designated 'Hittite' has frequently come up for notice already in the previous chapters. This term is used by modern historians and archaeologists in more than one sense; and the distinction which should be observed between its senses is not always obvious to readers, or, indeed, apprehended clearly by writers. It is imperative to mark a difference between its ethnical and cultural uses. As an *ethnical* term it should not be applied at present to any race or racial group referred to under another name than Khatti (*Hatti* or *Hati*, or Egyptian Kheta (Ḫt)), or Hebrew *Heth* and equivalent transliterations); or again to any people not specified as Hattic in such contemporary, or nearly contemporary, written records as we possess (Babylonian, Assyrian, Egyptian, Hebrew, Vannic or actual 'Hattic,' *i.e.* Cappadocian). Observance of this distinction will exclude from the ethnical use of the term a number of racial groups about which it can be argued, from the presence of monuments of Hittite character in their several localities, that they shared Hittite civilization—notably, in the first place, most of the peoples of southern Cappadocia, Phrygia, Lydia and Cilicia, in fact all the peoples of inner Asia Minor with exception of the northern Cappadocians, and, perhaps, of a group in the south of Cappadocia; in the second place, all peoples of northern Syria, except, perhaps, a group which occupied a strip of territory immediately south of the Taurus Mountains, another on the Euphrates' bank, and also an element of population in mid-Syria and Palestine; in the third place, all Mesopotamian peoples. In this chapter it is proposed to avoid the use of 'Hittite' in an ethnical sense, and to substitute 'Hatti' and 'Hattic' whenever race is in question.

The term Hittite will then be left to carry *cultural* significance only. As the proper designation of a certain type of civilization, distinguished by common use of a peculiar script and by practice of a particular art which depicts various human types (we cannot predicate, on present knowledge, community of

either language or religion), it has a larger content than the term 'Hattic.' The geographical area of Hittite civilization embraces the eastern half of Asia Minor with southern Phrygia and, 'possibly, Cilicia; also all north and north-central Syria, together with extensions across both the middle and the upper Euphrates, on the one hand, and into lands west of the central plain of Asia Minor on the other. Hittite civilization, therefore, occupied at a certain epoch all the inter-continental bridge between Asia and Europe, sitting astride the land-routes of communication between the elder civilizations of the heat-belt, and the younger of the temperate zone.

The sources of our information about things Hittite are various; and only within the last twenty years has it been possible to combine them into a thin stream of history, thanks to a discovery of cuneiform archives at Boghaz Keui in north-western Cappadocia. This is the site of the Hattic capital of, at any rate, the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C., when Hattic kings had imperial control of all Cappadocia, great part of Syria, and possibly also some part of central Asia Minor. The archives in question are clay tablets, written in part for those kings, but comprising also many documents or copies of documents written for their predecessors upon a throne which, whether at Boghaz Keui or on some other site, seems to have been Hattic for several previous generations. The view is held that these latter documents were collected, supplemented and ordered about 1300 B.C. to form an official library, on whose remains the modern excavators have lighted. Some of the tablets are in the Babylonian language, which was used as a diplomatic medium of communication over all the Near East. These can, of course, be read with some certainty. More, however, are couched in some six native allied dialects, according to the latest decipherers (*e.g.* Hrozný and Forrer), who agree in regarding the dialects as Indo-European, and put forward interpretations based on analogies with primitive Indo-European linguistic forms, especially those of Old Latin. To the six dialects they give the names Kanesian, Luvian, Balaic, proto-Hattic, Harrian and Mandaic, the last two being presumably foreign tongues spoken in north Mesopotamia rather than Cappadocia. The bulk of the tablets are in 'Kanesian,' by which is meant the common speech of mid-Cappadocia, where; on the site now known as Kara-Euyuk, stood a city, Kanes (or Ganesh, see p. 6), often mentioned upon clay tablets of a special Assyro-Cappadocian class, probably non-Hattic, which will be dealt with presently. In these dialectical documents determinatives (as in Babylonian) indicate

proper names of persons and places respectively, and other help towards their interpretation is given by lexicographical tablets, which contain lists of native words in the so-called 'Kanesian,' with equivalents in Assyro-Babylonian and Sumerian; these were made, no doubt, for the use of Cappadocian officials who had to conduct correspondence with Mesopotamia and Egypt. If such aids stood alone, too little could be made of the documents for any useful historical purpose to be served; but possible affinities of their dialects with a known Indo-European group encourage much wider hopes, and justify already some provisional reliance on the fragmentary translations put out by the decipherers to whom the Berlin authorities have committed the publication of their collection.

The second source of Hittite information consists in remains of architecture, art and script surviving above ground or excavated. The script, a pictographic system, elaborately carved in high relief or incised with simplified linear forms, was used to express what, no doubt, is the 'Kanesian' language in which the bulk of the Cappadocian cuneiform archives are written, and other languages besides. But the syllabic or alphabetic values of its very numerous characters, with a few not universally agreed exceptions, are still unfixed; and, therefore, in its case there are two unknowns—character-values as well as language. Inferences, however, of historical import may often be drawn from the artistic character, the distribution, etc., of illegible inscriptions; and similar but fuller inferences can be based upon other monuments which are architectural or plastic. So far as Asia Minor is concerned, the monuments in question are distributed fairly generally over north-western, central and southern Cappadocia, with Lycaonia. In northern Phrygia also, including Galatia, there are a few isolated monuments, strung out at wide intervals near or on the line of a natural track which leads down the Sangarius valley from Ancyra to Sardes and thence to the sea at the head of the Gulf of Smyrna. In the coastal provinces of the Peninsula, both north and south as well as west (with the single exception of that Sardes road), no examples have yet been found. The districts of Asia Minor in which Hittite monuments occur with such frequency as to argue the local prevalence at some period of either Hattic power, or at least Hattic cultural influence, are first, the vicinity of Yuzgad in the north-western corner of Cappadocia, where stand the ruins of Boghaz Keui and Euyuk Alaja; secondly, the central Cappadocian district round Mount Argæus, whose capital in later times was Mazaca-Caesarea; and thirdly, all the districts

which lie under the north face of the Taurus, from the neighbourhood of Iconium, in the west, to the Euphrates, near Melitene, in the east. These latter districts contain four considerable groups of such monuments, the Phrygian or Iconian, the Lycaonian or Tyranitic, the Anti-Tauric and the Melitenian. Between the first group and the sparse fringe of north Phrygian Hittite monuments mentioned above lies a wide gap; but between the southern groups linking monuments occur, mostly marking natural tracks of inter-communication. Thus, for example, the Kuru pass across the Anti-Taurus, and the valley of the Tokhma Su, which respectively connect the Mazaca group with the Anti-Tauric and the Melitenian groups, contain Hittite remains. Whether any (and if so, which) of these divers groups of Anatolian monuments belong to the Hattic Imperial Age will be discussed later.

In Syria, Hittite remains occur generally over the whole northern part, from the foothills of the Taurus at Marash to the middle Orontes valley at Restan; and from the Amanus range at Zenjirli to the Euphrates at Samosata and Carchemish. They have not yet been found in the classical Cilicia west of the Amanus range, nor on this range itself; nor again in the lower Orontes valley (Antioch district); nor at any point in the mountains west of this river. Nothing distinctively Hittite has been reported yet on the upper Orontes above Restan. On the left bank of the Euphrates, however, enough monuments have been found at several points to prove that Hittite civilization prevailed at a certain period in a long stretch of north-western Mesopotamia extending opposite Carchemish from Birejik (classical Zeugma) to Tell Ahmar (Assyrian Til-Barsip) and still farther south. For inner Mesopotamia (the Mitannian region) we have as yet but uncertain evidence. Sculptures, excavated at Tell Halaf near Rās el-Ain, show clear affinity to early Hittite art; but they are of very rude style and (so far as known at present) are unaccompanied by Hittite inscriptions of any type.

A third source of Hittite history is furnished by written and plastic records of foreign states and peoples, which were contiguous to, and in relation with, the Hittite area. Those of the Egyptian kingdom from the XVIIIth Dynasty to the XXIst Dynasty, covering a period of about two hundred and fifty years, refer frequently to wars and negotiations with Hatti; and a mass of cuneiform correspondence pertaining to the Egyptian Foreign Office during the later reigns of the XVIIIth Dynasty, which has been found at Tell el-Amarna, the capital of Amenhotep IV,

throws light not only on the Hatti, but on other peoples in their sphere of influence or upon their borders. See p. 128.

We have recovered also from the Semitic Mesopotamian states cuneiform records which refer to Hatti and their neighbours. Babylonian historical compilations, written, in post-Hittite times, to relate traditional events of remote ages, supply almost the only evidence available at present for Hittite history before the Hattic Imperial Age (see vol. I, p. 561). The Assyrian records in question are in the main contemporary with the events they record, and, therefore, subject to discount on grounds only of *ex parte* tenour, or obscurity. Those which refer to parts of the Hittite area or to actual Hattic peoples range, with interruptions, from the latter part of the second millennium to the seventh century B.C. Further there are Hebrew references in O.T. to Hittites (Heth). Their date, bearing and significance are so uncertain that they are best reserved for later consideration in connection with Syrian Hittite history, both early and late (vol. III). Lastly may be cited a few statements and memories of Greeks, which have possible bearing on Hittites, together with some mentions of Hatti and Hittite lands in the 'Vannic' cuneiform records of the kingdom of Urartu, which lay east of the northern Hittite area.

II. EARLIEST PERIOD, CAPPADOCIA

In northern Cappadocia a Hattic monarchical state has left written monuments of itself, from an uncertain early period, to the end of the thirteenth century B.C. During this latter century and the one preceding it, records of another power, the Egyptian, with which the Hattic monarchy clashed in a phase of imperial expansion, add intermittent witness. For the existence and history of that monarchy before the fifteenth century possible evidence is given by the documents from its capital, Hattushash (Boghaz Keui), which are couched in native languages. There is reason to find in these documents the names of several monarchs, and to discern interregnal periods¹. Even if these kings did not represent successive generations, they may reasonably be presumed to have filled much more than a century preceding 1430 B.C., which is the approximate date of the accession of Hattushil, father of Shubbiluliuma. It must have been from one of these fifteenth century monarchs that the Hattic envoys

¹ The names of some of the monarchs, of whom practically nothing can usefully be predicated yet except their existence, are given in the Synchronistic List at the end of this volume.

came, who, about 1469 B.C., met the Pharaoh, Thutmose III, in or near the Syrian Taurus. See p. 76 sq.

What the origin of the Hattic society and state may have been is a question at present unsolved. No really primitive archaeological material has come to light in any part of eastern Asia Minor—nothing, for example, representing so early a stage of culture as is illustrated by the lowest strata of remains at Hissarlik, or even by some early Bronze Age objects from Mysian and Pisidian tombs (see p. 554 sq.). As for written records, Babylonian references to Hattic invasions of Mesopotamia, during the third millennium and at the beginning of the second, will not be good evidence for Cappadocian Hatti until further light has been thrown on the source of those invasions. They may have started from another Hattic region, *e.g.* Syria or north Mesopotamia (see vol. I, p. 561). But besides the evidence of the earlier Boghaz Keui archives there are certain Assyrian references to be reckoned with; and also a particular class of documents, which, if not written by Assyrian scribes, betray strong Assyrian influence in Cappadocia and reveal an intimate connection between this country and Mesopotamia in the first part of the second millennium and even at earlier dates. The documents in question are cuneiform tablets, couched in a provincial dialect of Assyro-Babylonian, and judged, on various grounds, to be older, and generally much older, than the fifteenth century B.C. They have already been referred to in vol. I (see pp. 453 sqq.). To supplement what has there been given, it should be said that a few have been procured in Cappadocia itself, *e.g.* at Kara-Euyuk, about 11 miles E.N.E. of Kaisariyeh (Mazaca), and at Boghaz Keui (these last not in the process of scientific excavation). But the greater part of a total now amounting to thousands has been obtained from traders in Kaisariyeh or Constantinople, who have given their testimony—for what it is worth—that the tablets hail from Cappadocian sites. Most of these are said to come from Kara-Euyuk (p. 253, ancient Kanesh?). Two or three isolated specimens have been found outside Cappadocia, *e.g.* one near Mosul. One tablet, bought in Constantinople, bears the imprint of a royal signet, that of Ibi-Sin, king of Ur; and practically all recent students find that both the script and the proper names in this document accord with those of the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur (*i.e.* about twenty-fifth century B.C.).

If so early a date be accepted for any members of this class of documents, it will stand to reason that, at the least, a Cappadocian society of that age maintained commercial relations with

southern Mesopotamia, could read and write cuneiform, and understood Assyro-Babylonian; or, at the most, that the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur had a colonial empire embracing Cappadocia. The dialectical peculiarity of the language used tells (according to some Assyriologists) against the possibility of these documents having been written by true Mesopotamians, whether colonists or soldiers; but, at the same time, the frequent occurrence of the element Ashur in their proper names, and also their general type, witness to a degree of intimacy between Cappadocia and Assyria which argues political supremacy exercised by the latter. At all events, Cappadocian society had begun, in the first part of the second millennium at the latest, to practise regular trade with Assyria, and was so powerfully influenced by the latter's civilization that already it was advanced in culture according to the standards of its time. We can postulate with confidence, therefore, a period, probably lengthy, of Semitic influence before the Hattic in Cappadocia, and find in that fact adequate reason, not only for the conspicuous lack of Hittite pictographic inscriptions of early type in that area (nothing has yet been found in relieved script in northern Cappadocia except short labels and one long text on the Nishan Tash at Boghaz Keui), but also for the Cappadocian official use of cuneiform script in Hattic imperial times, and for the Assyrian character of the art which produced the earliest Cappadocian Hittite monuments known to us.

Early documents, found by German excavators at Kala'at Sherkat (Ashur), convey more than a hint of Assyrian domination exercised intermittently, if not continuously, over parts of eastern Asia Minor, which would account for this Semitization of Cappadocian society. Assyrian expansion north-westward seems to date back into the third millennium; and, unquestionably before the middle of the second, armies despatched from the middle Tigris were raiding the southernmost confines of Cappadocia and had attained, at any rate, the city of Arinna, even as an Egyptian army also would do in the fifteenth century (if the 'Araina' of Thutmose III is the same place). But the view that they went on to penetrate central and northern Cappadocia depends at present on the interpretation of a claim made by Shamshi-Adad, III (his date, at latest, is in the seventeenth century) that he reached the shore of the 'Great Sea' and, in a country called Laban, set up a monument of himself. Some commentators confidently find this locality on the coast of the Black Sea, where Sinope long preserved a tradition of an 'Assyrian' or 'Syrian' occupation (perhaps this only means Hattic). Others,

with perhaps better reason, think that the Assyrian king speaks of the coast of Syria (see vol. I, p. 568). No further record of Assyrian adventure in Cappadocia is known till the Hattic Imperial Age itself, when in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries successive thrusts by Ashur-uballit II, and also by the first great king of the Shalmaneser name, carried Assyrian arms into the Taurus (compare also pp. 241, 260 and 320).

Whether all or any of those Semitized Cappadocians of the third millennium and the early part of the second were of Hattic race, cannot be determined yet. Even if the published interpretation of the native documents from Boghaz Keui already cited be accepted, we cannot carry the Hattic dynasty back earlier than 1580. There is some reason to think that during most even of the fifteenth century, the Cappadocian Hatti were not completely independent of Assyria, and we have other reasons, but of less cogency, for believing that Boghaz Keui was not their original seat, but that Hattic kings had reigned elsewhere, either at Arinna or at Karsaūra (Garsaūra, afterwards Archelais and now Akserai), on the eastern edge of the Axylon plains.

Equally insoluble is the question whence the Hatti originally had come. Were they an 'Asiatic' people, who conquered with bronze imported from the Caucasus? Were they Alarodians from beyond the Caspian? Were they an Indo-European folk from Iran or beyond? Semitic influence is evident in the Cappadocian dialect; but, so far as we know at present, it is illustrated rather by borrowed words than by such structural modification of the language as would argue an admixture of true Semitic race. The Indo-European element is now considered to have been the dominant caste, as it also was in the land of Mitanni, with which the Cappadocian Hattic dynasty had many relations. But the prevailing language of Mitanni, an example of which we possess in a long cuneiform letter, found at Tell el-Amarna, is not Indo-European, but, according to most philologists, akin to Georgian (see vol. I, p. 469). Until more is known with certainty about the prevailing language of Cappadocia in the earlier part of the second millennium, no progress can be made towards a settlement of this question of Hattic origins; and since even that language may not have been the native tongue of the Hatti (if these were indeed only a conquering minority), we may then not be much wiser on this particular point. But we shall know at any rate who the bulk of the Cappadocians were. Present evidence points to north-west Mesopotamia and the Taurus as earlier homes of the Hattic element.

III. THE RISE AND FALL OF THE HATTI DYNASTY

The first sure historical light is shed by retrospective Hattic documents of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. They indicate that, more than a century before the earliest of them was written, a Hattic monarchy, ruling apparently from a north Cappadocian centre, already exercised dominant influence in south Cappadocia, in northern Syria, and even on the eastern bank of the middle Euphrates. A king, Dudkhalia, who was penultimate predecessor of Shubbiluliuma and reigned round about 1450 B.C., had relations with the Cataonian principality of Hanigalbat and with Aleppo. His successor, Hattushil, warred victoriously with the last-named power, which is supposed to have been of Harrian origin. These kings had the Harri, a Mesopotamian and north Syrian people (see vol. 1, p. 312), for neighbours, and Kissuwadna, a principality lying west of Hanigalbat (see p. 272), in their pocket. Whether their dominance had been established by conquest from the north or had survived from an earlier stage of Hattic residence in the south, we do not know: but, in either case, it amounted to a wide enough territorial power to justify us in speaking of a proto-Hattic imperial period, preceding the historical one, usually so called.

The second, or historic, imperial period was inaugurated by Hattushil's son, Shubbiluliuma, who succeeded somewhere about 1400 B.C.¹ There had been a crash in the last part of his father's reign and all the south, including even Kissuwadna, had shaken itself free under a revival of Harrian leadership. As records of Ashur-uballiṣ II inform us, Assyrian forces began to raid unchecked about 1415 B.C. across the Euphrates and into the Tauric principalities. Shubbiluliuma restored the earlier dominance of the Hatti in south Cappadocia, grappling Kissuwadna firmly to his allegiance on terms less easy than it had enjoyed before the revolt, and he prevailed against the prince of another Tauric state, Arzawa, who had been in independent correspondence with Egypt. It is also claimed for him that he forced the Harri to obedience; and this people appears later as confined to the Mesopotamian side of the Euphrates.

¹ The dates adopted by German editors of the Boghaz Keui archives are all later than those given here. Ascribing the treaty made by Hattushil with Ramses II to the latter's twenty-first regnal year, to 1271 B.C., they place Shubbiluliuma's accession in 1380, Murshil's 1345, Mutallu's 1315, Hattushil's 1272. The battle of Kadesh they date to 1287. Another computation (followed by R. Campbell Thompson, see p. 238) dates Shubbiluliuma at 1411 and Murshil at 1355.

How long a period this process of imperial restoration took we have no means of determining; but it may reasonably be presumed that not till it was complete would the Hattic king have ventured through the Tauric passes into Syria, to try conclusions with greater powers claiming spheres of exclusive influence there—Mitanni and Egypt. He had a strong body of federal troops with him, when the time for Syrian conquest arrived. To reform the Hattic confederacy as a power of offence must have taken some time; Shubbiluliuma's appearance in Syria (with this event anything like continuous Hattic history begins) can hardly, therefore, have been before the end of the first decade of the fourteenth century, and may have been as late as 1380 B.C. Records of his successors speak of Shubbiluliuma as the Great King *par excellence*, the Founder of his House. This fame may be owed to his later success in establishing foreign empire after restoring the old Cappadocian primacy of the dynasty: but it is possible also that he was the first of all Hattic kings to free himself from subordination to Assyria.

Shubbiluliuma spent some time in north Syria raiding and subjugating local chieftains in defiance of the susceptibilities not only of remote Egypt, but also of the nearer Mitannian kingdom. Whether originally or not he had set out to try conclusions with this latter Mesopotamian power, which had possessions west of the Euphrates, he found now that he had no choice but to force an issue upon it. Therefore, presently, with Harri co-operating, he crossed the river into Ishuwa and thence marched against Alshe and then against Tushratta, king of Mitanni, brother-in-law of Amenhotep III. It would be interesting to know how, at that time, the state of Carchemish regarded both the action of the Hattic invader in Syria and his attack on Mitanni. Its prince does not figure by name in our records of this conquest; but, if he was himself of old standing Hattic race, it is more than probable that he joined forces with Shubbiluliuma. If, on the other hand, a certain cultural change, which excavation at Carchemish has shown to have taken place in the second half of the second millennium B.C. (see vol. III), is to be dated as far back as the fourteenth century, then it will appear more probable that an unrecorded capture and reconstitution of Carchemish either now, or in the year following, has to be credited to Shubbiluliuma (the name of the town appears in a mutilated record of this king's movements after his conquest of Mitanni), and that it was only from this epoch forward that Carchemish became Hittite. More will be said later on this point in connection with

both the Hattic treaty concluded with Ramses II and the earliest history of north Syria.

Tushratta of Mitanni seems to have been successful in his first engagements with the Hattic forces; but in the end he was obliged to retire north-eastwards and suffer his kingdom to be ravaged so thoroughly that, though ultimately it obtained peace without submitting to worse terms than the acceptance of a client position, the support of Egypt was lost. The independence of the dynasty also was permanently impaired, and, shortly afterwards, Tushratta died a violent death, leaving his successor, Mattiuaza, to accept Shubbiluliuma's terms, and see his territory infringed on the west by the Hatti, and on the east by the Assyrians, who, ultimately, were to overrun the whole. See pp. 122, 301 *sq.*

Shubbiluliuma returned, after an interval of unknown duration, to Syria and marched into Aleppo. Partly now, partly before his Mitannian campaigns, he seems to have imposed his suzerainty on all the other petty principedoms, tribal states, and urban and village communities among which, so far south as Homs, Syria had been parcelled out under the nominal overlordship of a distant Pharaoh. We can establish no chronology of its conquest by the Hatti (except that Kinza was not attacked till after the king's entry into Aleppo), either from Hattic archives or from the Amarna Letters, for lack of criteria for classifying those documents, except in large groups according to the reigns in which they were written or received. Nor can we, with certainty, place on the map more than two or three of the several districts that they mention in this connection. We may say only that Shubbiluliuma did enter and force to his allegiance the following lands. (1) *Nukhashshi*, whose prince, Sharrupshi, held out long for his suzerain in Egypt. Conjecturally, his domain has been placed in the Killis district, north and west of Aleppo; it may have included all north-west Syria, with the town of Samāl (*Zenjirli*), of which no express mention is made in any document of this period. A mutilated copy of Shubbiluliuma's eventual treaty with Sharrupshi exists. (2) *Abina*, which we cannot place more closely than somewhere in the north-eastern region of Syria; it had owed allegiance formerly to Mitanni. (3) *Khalpa*, *Khalman* or *Halab*, which is Aleppo with, no doubt, the whole Kowaik basin. (4) *Niy* or *Nia*, whose prince, Takuwa, and his brother, Akit-Teshub, bear names of Amorite sound. Half-a-century or more before this period, under Thutmose III, *Niy* was spoken of as at the extreme limit of the Egyptian range, which extended to the Euphrates near Carchemish and to the Taurus. Its remoteness,

coupled with its former subjection to Mitanni and its probable Amorite character, suggests that it lay on the eastern edge of Syria proper, some way down the right bank of the Euphrates, below Carchemish. (5) *Katna*, which we know to have been on the farther side of the Euphrates, in the valley of the Lower Khabur. A Semitic state (probably), it proved hard for the Hattic king to persuade or force to submission; and its prince, Aki-izzi, was still at large, unrepentant and appealing to Pharaoh for support, in the early part of the reign of Amenhotep IV (about 1373 B.C., see p. 310). (6) *Kinza*, a state of apparently superior importance, whose prince, Shutatarra, offered stout resistance at first. But he seems, with his son, Aitakkama, not to have been long in accepting the new suzerainty, and the son became the leading ally and agent of Shubbiluliuma in the south. The precise location of Kinza is a puzzle; but since its prince's name recalls the Sutu, prominent in later accounts of Assyrian raids down the Khabur, and since it was able to attack directly Tushratta's successor in mid-Mesopotamia, it seems probable that, like Katna, it was a Semitic trans-Euphratean state, lying in the Belikh basin over against Niy. (7) *Tunip*, mentioned also in Egyptian and Assyrian annals as in or near Naharain, was almost certainly in the lower valley of the Sajur, where its name is still attached to a *tell*. (8) *Lapana* was perhaps the same district as Labnana, mentioned in annals of Tiglath-pileser III. Apparently it lay beyond (west of) the Orontes, and should be some part of the Lebanon range, whose name seems to be a survival of it; perhaps it was the northernmost part, Jebel Ansariyeh. (9) *Zinzar* and *Rukhizzi*, which cannot be placed; the former name probably belongs to the north-east, or even to Mesopotamia.

The only other important facts about this conquest of north Syria and north-western Mesopotamia of which we can be reasonably sure, are that Akizzi (Aki-izzi), prince of Katna, formed a league of local chiefs and procured a fresh revolt of the Harri in order to stay Shubbiluliuma's progress, but in vain; and that he was defeated either by the Hattic king himself, who appears to have gone in person across the Euphrates again, or by Aitakkama, of Kinza, who, after some shilly-shallying, illustrated by the Amarna correspondence, threw in his lot with the Hatti. With the collapse of this league, Shubbiluliuma's way lay open into the block of Amorite territory which then occupied all central Syria, including Kadesh, but not the Lebanon littoral; but invasion seems to have been forestalled by the submission of Azira (Aziru), paramount sheikh of the Damascus district, who tardily agreed

to an onerous tribute (see also pp. 302, 309). Even Pharaoh preferred negotiation to fighting. A treaty of peace was concluded and signed by Shubbiluliuma and Amenhotep III, shortly before the latter's death (or by his successor?). It held good through subsequent Egyptian reigns till it was denounced or ignored by Seti I, who, after Shubbiluliuma's death, made more than one effort to recover the empire which Ikhnaton had lost.

At some date, not earlier than 1360 B.C., Shubbiluliuma died, and after an interval of some years, filled by struggles between the heir, Arnuwandash (Arandas) and his brother Murshil (called in Egyptian M-r-s-r), the latter secured the throne. A cuneiform document which chronicles his first ten royal years has been found at Boghaz Keui. Since it is not in Babylonian, hardly anything can be read from it with certainty except proper names; but its frequent mention of what seem to be north Syrian places and princes serves to assure us that the affairs of at least as large an area, as had concerned Shubbiluliuma, continued to engage the attention of his successor. Carchemish, several of whose princes (?) are named in Murshil's annals, evidently adhered to the allegiance, which voluntarily or under duress it had given to Shubbiluliuma; and from a treaty with Rimisharma, king of Aleppo, we know that this city also remained faithful. Kissuwadna had been sufficiently chastened by Murshil's father to be admitted to free clientship again as an autonomous principality on condition of its having the same friends and enemies as the Hatti, and sending help to the latter's wars whether with the Harri or with Arzawa, which seem to have been its neighbours on east and west. The treaty between Shunashshura, its king, and (presumably) Murshil has come down to us in a copy made by the latter's successor. It provides for the abolition of frontier fortifications. The Amorites of mid-Syria were the chief breakers of the peace. Murshil maintained his father's policy towards Mitanni, whose value as a buffer between the Hattic dependencies and the growing Assyrian power on the middle Tigris prescribed cultivation of good relations. Hardly less valuable in view of the Assyrian menace (see pp. 238 *sqq.*) was the friendship of the Kassite kings of lower Mesopotamia, which, as we gather from later Hattic records, had previously been sought and obtained by the Hattic monarchy.

At what precise date Murshil died we do not know; probably not before 1330. His son, Mutallu (Muwatallis) succeeded, and soon was at open odds with Seti I of Egypt, whose thrusts northward were followed by a southward Hattic counter-thrust up the

Orontes valley. Seti was succeeded about the close of the century (or, according to another reckoning, in 1292) by Ramses II. Probably that vigorous southward offensive, which carried the Hatti past Kadesh, was not achieved till Seti's death; for it is when a throne is vacant in the east that aggression upon distant frontiers usually happens. In any case, by Kadesh, at or near the modern Tell Nebi Mandib, above the southern end of the Lake of Homs, in Ramses' fifth regnal year, the armies of the rival suzerains of Syria met in a pitched battle, of which the Egyptian account has long been famous. This narrative is the composition of a court poet and hardly historical material; but a fragmentary Hattic account of the same events, found at Boghaz Keui, seems to confirm some particulars of it (see pp. 142 *sqq.*). The result of the engagement alone matters here. The Hattic king and his federals were not dislodged from Kadesh; the Egyptians withdrew again to Palestine. The two powers were still in touch on the same frontier, in northernmost Galilee, when Mutallu, who died by violence, was no longer reigning, and Ramses had sent up two (or three?) more armies to try to restore the Egyptian position. Finally, in his twenty-first regnal year, Pharaoh accepted a treaty of permanent peace, on terms *uti possidetis*, with Hattushil the Second (or perhaps Third), the brother and successor of his opponent at Kadesh.

The earlier part of Hattushil's long reign, which did not close till far on in the thirteenth century, saw the acme of this Hattic imperial phase; in his later years decline began. More of his archives than of any other Hattic king have been unearthed, and enough of the documents are couched in Babylonian for us to be surely informed about the general course of events and the direction of Hattic imperial energies. Syria, down to the north Palestinian border, was now an exclusively Hattic sphere of influence and a source of Hattic revenue. Since, moreover, the Kassite king of Babylon, as a letter proves, regarded Hattushil as responsible for the desert tribesmen, we may infer that the Hattic king was recognized overlord also of the Amorite settled elements in Syria, for instance those which then held the oasis of Damascus (cf. p. 240). Hattushil was on terms of intimacy with the court of Babylon and assumed the tone of an equal in writing to Pharaoh—a tone sufficiently justified by the treaty of alliance, already mentioned, which Egypt made with him about the tenth year of his reign.

This famous treaty is so worded as to appear an equal compact, obligations of defence and offence, and extradition of political

and 'unknown' (servile?) fugitives being reciprocal; but nevertheless there are two points about it which possibly imply some recognition of inferiority by the Hattic party. The first is that Hattushil (both versions of this clause, Hattic and Egyptian, are mutilated) asks of Pharaoh a favour in regard to his own successor; the second, that the first overtures for alliance were made almost certainly from the Hattic side, an express statement of Ramses to that effect being supported by the Hattic version. The first draft of the treaty was composed at Hattushash and submitted to Pharaoh, inscribed in cuneiform on a silver plate. There has been found on two clay tablets at Boghaz Keui what is probably part of that draft, written before the metal was engraved. The Egyptian text, of which we have two imperfect copies, is a hieroglyphic rendering of a Babylonian text, the same in substance as the original Hattic draft; but its phraseology has been revised to suit Pharaonic susceptibilities. The list of towns, however, whose gods are called by Hattushil to witness (we have only the Egyptian text of this clause and it is defective), implies that Ramses recognized Hattic dominion over four-fifths at least of Syria. The 'land Hatti' and the 'land Misri,' which, in the fourth clause, are each guaranteed by the sovereign of the other immune for ever from invasion, are not defined; but the citation of the goddess of 'D-r' (*i.e.* Tyre) by Hattushil implies that Ramses had been reduced to accept Palestine as sole remainder of the Egyptian empire in Asia. The only other Syrian city in the list, whose identification is possible at present, is Halab (Aleppo); see further, p. 149 *sq.*

It has been observed with surprise that Carchemish does not appear in that list. Three, if not four proper names, however, are missing from our text after the citation of Halab, while certain others are imperfect; and it may be that the phrase 'Astarte of the land of Hatti,' which occurs in what should be the Syrian section of the list, implies and involves the capital of a region which later Assyrian scribes would always call Hatti-land. Were, however, the omission of Carchemish certain, we should have to presume one of two explanations. Either Carchemish had by then been absorbed into Hattushil's home territory, and become a state directly governed and no longer federal; or it had fallen temporarily under some non-Hattic power, probably Assyria. The last alternative is far from impossible. Shalmaneser I was on the Middle Euphrates at or about the date of this treaty (according to the generally accepted chronology of his annals) and was raiding across the river into Melitene (Hanigalbat) and Kumani,

north of Taurus. In any case, Assyrian westward expansion forces itself on our attention about this time (see p. 241 sq.). There can be little doubt that it provoked Hattushil's overture to Egypt; for a letter written by him to Kadashman-Enlil, Kassite king of Babylon (a copy of it in Babylonian was found at Boghaz Keui), betrays apprehension of Assyrian aggression about two years before. As the menace from the east increased Hattushil sought to draw his bond with Egypt tighter, and, some thirteen years after the conclusion of the treaty, sent one of his daughters to the harem of Ramses. A cuneiform copy of a letter from Naptera, the latter's queen, to Pudukhipa, queen of Hattushil, alludes to the treaty as a guarantee of peace between Egypt and Hatti. It is of peculiar interest that Pharaoh should have asked his Hattic friend to supply him with smelted iron. A copy of the reply, stating that at the moment none was to hand in the magazines in Kissuwadna, has been found at Boghaz Keui (p. 272). This correspondence offers us a very close date for the introduction of iron in bulk into Asia Minor, and thence into Egypt, where it had been hitherto a rarity used by jewellers.

Hattushil's reign ended before the middle of the thirteenth century. Probably he predeceased the aged Ramses by some twenty years. A son, Dudkhalia (cf. Tid'al, vol. 1, p. 236), succeeded. We know little about either his reign or that of his son and successor Arnuwandash (Arandas); but a fragment of his annals exists, conveying the interesting assurance that Carchemish had returned to the Hattic federation—if it ever had left it; and from another document we learn that Aleppo was still in the Hattic sphere of influence. Neither of Hattushil's successors is noticed in non-Hattic records, nor is the next and last king, a son of Arnuwandash, called Dudkhalia, like his grandfather. Since a reasonable computation of time for the duration of three reigns after that of Hattushil II would bring the story to the end of the thirteenth century, and a well-known record of Ramses III states that 'Hatti' had 'not stood before' a horde which subsequently devastated Kedi (the Cilician plain), Carchemish, Arvad and Alashiya, it is probable that Dudkhalia was in actual fact the last king of the dynasty of Shubbiluliuma, and the last Hattic prince of north Cappadocia.

If the appearance of this horde on the Egyptian frontier be dated about the year 1190 (though this will depend upon the chronology of Ramses II), its conquest of the north Cappadocian Hatti must be placed some two or three years earlier—possibly even more. (We have to observe that it must be concluded

that north Cappadochian, and not Syrian, Hatti are in question here, because, in the list of conquered territories evidently enumerated from north to south, 'Hatti' is divided from Carchemish by the name Kedi.) The names of this horde's tribal constituents, given by the Egyptian record, leave the question of its origin obscure. 'Hatti' themselves appear in the list (and also are to be identified by their facial type, in Egyptian reliefs representing the invasion); but they have not the prominence accorded to them in records of the previous Egyptian dynasty. Mentioned along with other peoples, *e.g.* men of Kedi, who also are stated not to have 'stood before' the horde, and with Amorites, they have sunk to a subordinate position in the service of recent conquerors. It is doubtful how many of the strange peoples, enumerated as sharing in the attacks on Egypt, were concerned in the first movement of this horde, and the problem of the origin of their names—Pulesati, Shakalsha, Zakkara, Denyen, Uashasha—still awaits an entirely convincing solution (see pp. 275 *sqq.*). Some part of the elements which attacked Egypt came in ships. These may really have been maritime peoples, or they may have taken to the sea only for the occasion, after securing transport at Arvad or elsewhere on the Syrian coast. If the Hattic capital had been its first objective, the original horde may be presumed to be of northern composition; but whether its elements came from western or from northern Asia Minor, or not rather (as is equally probable) from a Caucasian or Armenian region, must remain a matter of opinion.

Thus, according to present knowledge, the history of the Hattic Imperial State closes with the thirteenth century; and it is from about 1200 B.C. that we have to look back over such evidence as can be gathered from its monuments and records and those of its neighbours about its composition, organization and culture. Hattic 'empire' was certainly of the type which prevailed in western Asia before the Sargonid development of the Assyrian empire and the rise of Persia. Only a few provinces were ruled by direct action from the centre. Beyond them lay a belt of federated client-states, which were left to manage their own internal affairs, provided they observed their suzerain's external policy and followed him to war. Beyond these again were states within a 'sphere of influence,' bound to tributary acknowledgment, as the price of immunity, and expected to give the suzerain passage and supplies on his lawful occasions. When the empire was at its height under Hattushil II the federated client category comprised, in all probability, those cities and districts whose patron-deities

were called to attest his treaty with Ramses, and if we had its fifteenth clause complete, we should know all their names. But there would remain the difficulty, insuperable at present, of identifying more than a small proportion of them with known localities; and especially of determining what relation the named cities bore to districts. That is to say, we should still not know which, if any, city-names imply the clientship of known districts—for example, we should not be certain which (if any), not only of the Syrian states reduced by Shubbiluliuma (none except Halab, is named expressly in the clause in question), but also of the chain of states lying immediately north of the Taurus (none of these is mentioned, though Arinna may be presumed to cover Kissuwadna), were involved.

IV. CIVILIZATION

Our estimate of the degree of civilization attained by the Hattic empire will depend to some extent upon our answer to the question, Which, if any, of the known monuments of Hittite art are to be ascribed to its period? The other evidence would certainly lead us to expect that most of these were made in the Imperial Age. This theocratic society of the Hatti knew and used the diplomatic script and language of its time, observed international usages, and was expert in metallurgy, armed up to the highest contemporary standard, and sufficiently organized to keep land-registers and public inventories of temple furniture. It is believed also to have had codified law. Two lengthy clay documents from the Boghaz Keui archives have been deciphered¹ more or less completely and convincingly as parts of a criminal code recalling in many respects that of Hammurabi, notably by the rights given to women and slaves, the control of prices, the regulation of agriculture and inheritance, and the penalties prescribed for sexual offences. That such a society, in its period of imperial expansion, should not have practised monumental art at its chief centres of power and population is hardly credible. On the sites of several of these centres—at Boghaz Keui, Euyuk Alaja, Kizli Hissar (Tyana), Marash, Jerablus (Carchemish) and many more, as well as in their neighbourhoods—examples of monumental art do exist, carved either on the living rock, or on free stones. Their relations and affinities cannot be discussed here; but it may be said, shortly that, if the monuments are judged

¹ Reference to this publication is given in the Bibliography. The translation must be regarded at present as too conjectural for historical use to be made of details of the code.

by comparative standards of style and execution, the most primitive are the gateway-lions of Boghaz Keui, the dado-reliefs and the sphinxes of Euyuk, and, possibly, some sculptures of northernmost Syria and mid-north Mesopotamia. Second in the evolution come the rock-sculptures of Yasili Kaia, of Ferakda (Arinna?), and perhaps of Melitene (Hanigalbat), of Giaur Kalesi in Galatia and of the pass of Nymphi in Lydia. In the third place rank the 'King's Gate' relief at Boghaz Keui, most of the Tyanean and Iconian reliefs, and the earlier sculptures discovered by the excavators of Carchemish; and in the fourth and last place, the later Syrian Hittite sculptures.

In the second of the Cappadocian groups we see a fully-formed, peculiar art; but it is not, to all appearances, divided by a great interval of time from that of the first group. Clear evidence of earlier and later periods of building has been observed at both Boghaz Keui and Euyuk. If the monuments of the first artistic group belong to Shubbiluliuma's time, those of the second are naturally to be ascribed to the period of Hattushil. This is the date most usually assumed for the rock-sculptures of Yasili Kaia. Some critics, however, have found in their style such close analogies to the arts of the late Assyrian empire and of the late Ramessid period in Egypt, that they have refused to refer them to any period earlier than the eleventh century B.C.; and it must be admitted that their close resemblance to Syrian Hittite sculptures, and to certain metal objects of the Syrian 'Cremation Period,' which, on comparison with Cypriote parallels and sculptures from Zenjirli, can hardly be pushed back as far as 1000 B.C., supports a post-Imperial date. On the other hand, the foreign features observed in Yasili Kaia art can be explained by a prior Assyrian style, revealed by the German excavations at Ashur, and by influence of an earlier Egyptian art than the later Ramessid; and it is not difficult to account for the appearance of types of Hattushil's time two or three centuries later in Syria, if, as will be seen in vol. III, there is reason to ascribe most of the Hittite monuments of Syria to an immigrant people which imported a culture learned by earlier generations. In point of fact, however, our knowledge of Hittite art in the thirteenth century B.C. does not depend on monuments of disputed date. We have precise chronological evidence from seal-impressions stamped on cuneiform tablets in that century, while their clay was still wet and unbaked, *i.e.* at the time at which they were written. Several of these stamps show figures of kings or gods executed in the Yasili Kaia style. Therefore, when objections to the monuments of the

Second Hittite group being ascribed to the Hattic Imperial Age are balanced against arguments on the other side, we can appeal not merely to the *a priori* improbability that this Age should have been responsible for no great Cappadocian monuments, but to positive evidence in favour of Yasili Kaia having been carved in the reign of Hattushil or some other Hattic king of the thirteenth century B.C. As for Syria, its Hittite monuments, as well as most of those in south-eastern Asia Minor, must be reserved for consideration in a later connection (cf. below, p. 427 sq.).

According to our classification, then, the sculptures at Yasili Kaia and Boghaz Keui; at Ferakdin and in its near neighbourhood; some at Melitene; those at Giaur Kale, at the Midas City, and in the Kara Bel near Nymphi, these all are witnesses to Cappadocian culture under the Hattic empire; and, therefore, account can be taken unreservedly of their testimony to Hattic religion, manners, armament, facial type, fashion of dress and so forth. Both Yasili Kaia and Ferakdin appear to record the conjunction or the fusion of two cults. The procession which advances from the left at Yasili Kaia is headed by a male who, usually bearing a bow, is the most common and characteristic of Hattic divine figures. He is certainly the Hattic war-god, Tarkhun. The right-hand procession is headed by a goddess, the same, without doubt, who appears enthroned at Ferakdin and Euyuk. She should be that Sun-goddess of Arinna who enjoyed, in the Hattic Imperial state, honour as great as the chief god's. At Ferakdin a male votary adores this god, and a female, the goddess. We may guess the mortals to be Hattushil himself and his queen, Pudukhipa.

What may have become of Hattushash and the Cappadocian realm of the Hatti after the opening of the twelfth century must be left for discussion in the next volume, where questions concerning the Syrian Hatti of Carchemish and neighbourhood, as well as the Palestinian 'Children of Heth' (Gen. xxiii), may also be dealt with more appropriately than here. But before the consideration of the Hatti of Asia Minor is concluded, a word may be said about the principal states, north of the Taurus, which appear to have been subject to, or allied with, them.

Those, whose local situations can be guessed with reasonable probability and of which anything important is known beyond names, have all been mentioned already. Four probably lay under, or in, the Taurus, namely Hanigalbat, Kissuwadna, Arzawa and Tyana (or an unnamed state of which this city was the capital); two to the north of these, Kash or Kashkai (Gashga) and Karsatira

(Garsura). Between these last two, in the Argaeus district, another state whose capital city bore later the name Mazaca, perhaps at an earlier period and on a different site, that of Kani. Of all these states, those lying farthest west, Tyana and Garsauri and those farthest east, Hanigalbat and Kash, appear to have been less dependent on the Hatti than the central states, Kissuwadna, Arzawa and the Argaeus district, through the first and last of which lay military ways from north Cappadocia to Syria.


Kissuwadna is assumed here to have been situated to the south of the Hattic home-state and in the Anti-Taurus. This location which is not accepted by all modern authorities, rests on two kinds of inferential evidence. First, on a reasonable probability that Arinna, its chief holy city, is to be identified with 'Araina' which an Egyptian army reached during a north Syrian campaign and 'Arūna,' which Assyrian arms reached through Meliten (Hanigalbat). Second, on the association of Kissuwadna with the Harri and Aleppo in Hattic official documents—an association not only political but geographical. On these two grounds alone it seems impossible to place it, as has been proposed, in north Cappadocia or Pontus, and to suppose that the sea, which according to the boundaries specified in Murshil's treaty, it touched at one point, can have been the Black Sea. Indeed the very argument relied upon by those who place it in the north—the mention of it in Hattushil's letter to Ramses II as a land where iron was stored (p. 267)—perhaps favours a southern position: for did not Hattushil intend to convey that he had no iron to hand at the moment at a Kissuwadnian port from which he would naturally export to Egypt? Such a port might have been on the Issus gulf, to which an Anti-Tauric state would have had access by the Sarus basin. On this theory of its location Kissuwadna must have contained another important religious centre besides Arinna (possibly at, or near, Ferakdin), namely Kumani (Comana Cappadociae, at Shahr in the Anti-Taurus), which Assyrian records mention as though it were independent.

A state or people called Tabal or Tibal appears in later Assyrian records in some part of what had been Kissuwadna. Hebrew genealogists coupled its name (as Tubal) with Meshech (Ezek. xxvii, 13); and probably, like this latter state (or people), which makes a first appearance in history about 1150 B.C., Tibal was established in these parts only after the Hattic catastrophe. Assyrian forces reached it through north-eastern Cilicia (p. 247).

Arzawa, whose prince, Tarkhundaraba, had corresponded with Amenhotep III before being constrained to accept Shubbilma-

INDEX TO NAMES

| | |
|--|--|
| Abina (?), F ₃ | Kash or Gaga, FG 1, 2 |
| Aleppo, F ₃ | Kishur, R, H ₃ 4 |
| Alshu (?), G ₃ | Kinza (?), G ₃ |
| Amorites, FG ₄ | Kisuwadna, F ₂ |
| Anti-Taurus Mts., EF ₂ | Kobby, E ₃ |
| Arameans, FG ₃ | Kamasi, F ₂ |
| Arinna (?), E ₂ | Karumshik, GH 2, 3 |
| Arpad, F ₃ | Layana (?), EF ₄ |
| Arzawa (?), DF ₃ | Mar'ash, F ₃ |
| Ashur, I ₄ | Mazza, E ₂ |
| Assyria, I ₃ , 4 | Midal, G ₂ |
| Babylon, K ₅ | Metani, GH ₃ |
| Beilki, R, G ₃ | Metani, GH ₃ |
| Bilejik, G ₃ | Muski, E ₂ , 3, GH ₃ |
| Boghaz Keui, E ₂ | Nineveh, I ₃ |
| | Niy (?), FG 3, 4 |
| Carchemish (Gargamish), G ₃ | Nubhashin, F ₃ |
| Cyprus, DE ₄ | |
| Damascus, F ₅ | Orontes R., F ₃ , 4 |
| Dor, E ₅ | Petro, G ₃ |
| Euphrates R., GH 1-5 | Pyramus R., EF ₃ |
| Eyruk Alaya, E ₁ | Restan, F ₄ |
| Gargamish (Carchemish), G ₃ | Sagar, R, F ₃ |
| Garsuira, E ₂ | Sam'al, F ₃ |
| Gaza or Kishi, FG 1, 2 | Samet, G ₃ |
| Gaurina, F ₂ | Sangamut, R, C ₁ |
| Gurgum, FG ₃ | Saules or Sarr (Sparta), A ₂ |
| Halepa (Aleppo), F ₃ | Sarus, R, E ₃ , F ₂ |
| Halep (Red River), DEF 1, 2 | |
| Hamath, F ₄ | Tabal, F ₂ |
| Hanigalbat, FG ₂ | Tarus, E ₃ |
| Harri, FG ₃ | Taurus Mts. EF ₃ |
| Hatti, E ₂ | Tigris R., G-K 2-5 |
| Hattina, F ₄ | Til Barsip, G ₃ |
| | Tupip (?), F ₃ |
| Ishuwa (?), G ₁ | Tyana, E ₃ |
| | Tyre, E ₅ |
| Kadesh (?), GH 1-3, F ₄ | |
| Kazas (?), E ₂ | Uchi, EF ₃ |
| Kardunash, H ₃ | |



liuma's overlordship and send his contingent to the Syrian war, became so intimately connected with the Hatti that its archives appear among those found at Boghaz Keui. Since it seems to have lain some distance to the south of the Hattic homeland, a situation is proposed for it in the Cilician Taurus, where proper names compounded with the divine element, Tarkhu, survived to late times. In any case it lay near enough to Egypt to make mutual correspondence easy and natural. The mention of it in Murshil's treaty with Shunashshura implies that it was a neighbour of Kissuwadna; but the absence of its name from all known Assyrian records suggests that it lay beyond the ordinary range of Assyrian campaigning—probably well over to the west in Cilicia Tracheia, where it may have included Isauria and the Iconian district.

Tyana is not mentioned in any certainly deciphered passage of a Hattic document; but there is no doubt that, both before and after 1200 B.C., it was one of the most important places in western Asia. All the Hittite monuments which have been discovered in its district seem, however, to belong to a period of non-Hattic domination subsequent to the downfall of the Cappadocian empire. We must conclude therefore that the Hatti never absorbed Tyana sufficiently to 'Hattize' its society; but that later it became the centre of some other, perhaps a Mushkian, power, which had adopted Hittite culture at a previous stage of its history.

About the two eastern states, Hanigalbat and Kash, we hear a good deal from Assyrian sources. The first appears to have been attached to the Hattic empire by a very weak bond, which was frequently broken. The second was a constant object of Hattic expeditions, military or otherwise; and published records of Boghaz Keui make it clear that it remained an enemy state imperfectly subjugated, of greater size and importance than any other in Cappadocia, and a constant cause of Hattic apprehension. Hanigalbat is shown by sculptures and inscriptions found in the 'Lion Mound' at Ordasu, near Malatia, to have had Hittite culture; but it is not stated in any document to have been conquered by a Hattic king, nor is it mentioned (nor any city in it) in Hattushil's treaty with Egypt as either Hattic client or ally. Lying far over to the east, where the Euphrates is easily crossed above the Taurus, it frequently saw Mesopotamian forces, whether Assyrian or Mitannian, appear within its borders, and perhaps it passed for a time under the domination of Ashur-uballit or his successor, when Shubbiluliuma was marching into Syria, as it would again under that of Shalmaneser, when Hattu-

shil II was making his peace with Ramses. It seems certainly to have had some connection with Kash—in the twelfth century an Assyrian record groups it with that state and with Gurgum, which lay immediately south of Taurus—and to have shared Kashite policy and fortunes, or even perhaps to have been occupied during a certain period by 'Kashkians.' Kash also was not Hattic either in race or in normal political allegiance; not can it, on present evidence, be reckoned within the Hittite area, although it lay contiguous to the Hattic home state; for eastern Cappadocia, north of the Tokhma Su, has yielded no Hittite remains.

As for Mazki or Mushki (Hebrew, Meshech), which armies of the later Assyrian empire used to attack from Khilakku (central Cilicia), this people or state, which appears to have been of first-rate importance in eastern and central Asia Minor during the twelfth and succeeding centuries, is not mentioned either in any Hattic document or in the earlier Assyrian records at present available. It must, therefore, be presumed to have been post-Hattic. There is good reason to regard Tyana, after 1200 B.C., as either its capital or one of its chief centres; and possibly in the name, Mazaka, we have evidence of the earlier presence of Mushki (Mazki) in the Argæus district.

CHAPTER XII

THE KEFTIANS, PHILISTINES, AND OTHER PEOPLES OF THE LEVANT

I. THE KEFTIANS AND THE PEOPLES OF THE SEA

ONE of the most important enquiries in the ancient history of the Near East relates to the explanation, in the light of modern archaeological research, of the Egyptian records of connection, peaceful or hostile, with certain seafaring tribes of the Mediterranean coasts, apparently Cyprus, the southern coast of Asia Minor, Crete, and the Aegean. This enquiry is intimately connected with the question of the racial identity of the Philistines, who appear to have been one of the most important of these tribes, and to have settled in Palestine after the repulse of an attack which they made in the reign of Ramses III, about 1190 B.C. (see p. 174 *sq.*). The discovery of the origin of this hitherto enigmatical people, who always appear in the O.T. narratives as foreigners totally distinct from the Semitic inhabitants of Palestine, is due to the decipherment of the Egyptian records.

Not the least notable discovery of the older Egyptologists was the identification of these tribes as bearing names similar to those of peoples of Asia Minor, Greece, and, apparently, even Italy, that are famous in classical tradition. Thus, even Champollion, the pioneer of Egyptology, writing before 1832, not only identified the Philistines of biblical tradition, but also recognized the Ionians in the reign of Ramses II as allies of the northern people whom he called 'Schéto,' afterwards known to be identical with the Hatti of the Assyrians and the biblical Hittites. In 1857 Birch identified Keftiu with the biblical Caphtor, either Crete, or, preferably, Cyprus. In the same year Brugsch identified the Keftians preferably with the Cretans rather than the Cyprians; the Shardana, he was certain, came from the farther Mediterranean, not from the Palestinian coast, and the Pulesati (Purasati or Pelishti) were the Philistines, as Champollion had said. Ten years later de Rougé wrote his epoch-making article (*Revue Archéologique*, 1867) which for the first time asserted the historical identity of these tribes *en bloc*: identifying the *Masa* as Mysians, *Luka* as Lycians, *Dardeni* as Dardanians, *Akaiwasha*

as Achaeans, *Tursha* as Tyrrhenians, *Shakalsha* as Siculi, and *Shardina* as Sardinians. De Rougé certainly conceived of the three last tribes as coming from Italy, Sicily and Sardinia. Herein he was followed by Chabas in his *Études sur l'Antiquité historique* (1873), after the death of de Rougé, who had never been able to complete the task which he had set himself of following up his identification into the maze of Greek legend. Chabas adds to his Italians the *Daanau*, whom he calls Daunians, and the *Uashasha*, mentioned by Ramses III, whom he calls Osci. He forgot that the Osci were really Opsci, the Ὀπικοί of the Greeks; and of course philological impossibilities of this kind were eagerly seized upon by the opponents of the new knowledge, who were specially strong among the classical scholars of Great Britain and of Germany. There, Brugsch now made a groundless attempt to prove that all these tribes were not Peoples of the Sea at all, but inland folk from the regions of the Caucasus. This view was probably credited in this country for a generation. Also, Lenormant, in his ancient history, and Gladstone, in his *Juventus Mundi*, fantastically exaggerated the result of the new knowledge, so that the contribution of Egyptology to the elucidation of the early history of Greece remained under a cloud until Maspero sifted the wheat from the chaff, insisted on the incontrovertible facts, and pointed out the way in which we were to interpret them. Sir Charles Oman, in his *History of Greece* (1890), was probably the first English historian of Greece to accept the *Akaiwasha* unreservedly as Achaeans. Since then, but for an attempt by Prof. Petrie to prove that the Akaiwasha, and other allies of the Mashauasha, or Maxyes (p. 166), against Merneptah were Libyans like them, the general identification of these 'Peoples of the Sea' has not been challenged, except on minor counts. It is now commonly held, therefore, that they were tribes of the Mediterranean, some of them Greeks living in the Aegean, who attacked Egypt in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C., having already appeared on the coasts of Syria as early as the end of the fifteenth.

The late Egyptian name for Greeks generally was *Ouecienin*, which may be regarded as a corrupt form of Ἰάων (Yāwān), or of the hieroglyphic name *Ha-nebu* (presumably pronounced something like *Ho-nim*), which was used for Ἕλληνες in the Ptolemaic Canopus decree, and occurs at least as early as the Vth Dynasty (Pyramid Temple of Sahure) for people living in the Delta. It is probable that it originally meant 'the Marsh-people,' and, by a process familiar to those acquainted with Egyptian hieroglyphs, in later times it probably came to mean to the Egyptians 'Lords of

the North,' or, perhaps, 'All the Northerners.' It then denoted the Mediterranean peoples generally, and so, eventually, 'Greeks'; but it may be doubted whether originally it meant more than non-Egyptian inhabitants of the Delta-coast, perhaps seagoers, perhaps, indeed, Mediterraneans. In any case it is probable that direct relations existed between the Egyptians and the Cretans as early as the Egyptian predynastic period and it is certain that they existed during the time of the Old Kingdom, and continued through that of the Middle Kingdom to the XVIIIth Dynasty and the period of Cnossus. This we know from the evidence of Cretan archaeology¹. 'Ha-nebu,' we may conclude, was a general term for Northerners, and, therefore, for Greeks.

We now come to the specific historical groups of the men of Keftiu or 'Men of the Isles,' and the 'Peoples of the Sea.' The latter appellation has the ancient authority of a description of the tribes of this group as living 'in the midst of the sea,' and is conveniently restricted to the tribes who warred with or took service in Egypt from the time of Amenhotep III to that of Ramses III. The 'Men of the Isles' (this name is used as an alternative for, or as a description of, the Keftians) are a somewhat earlier group, which appears in the time of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, and does not reappear afterwards. This fact is very important, in view of the other fact that these Keftians or Men of the Isles were Minoans (probably from Crete), and it is to the fourteenth century that we must ascribe the fall of the Minoan culture in Crete before the attacks of just such migratory piratical tribes as the 'Peoples of the Sea' who troubled Egypt for so long (p. 442 sq.).

The 'Peoples of the Sea' were not Minoans: they did not wear the Minoan costume, as did the Keftians and Men of the Isles. But their costume was that worn by peoples not unknown to the

¹ It would now seem that the greatest period of Minoan culture was the Third Middle Minoan, contemporary with the latter part of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (XIIIth Dynasty and Hyksos Period). The 'Great Palace period,' contemporary with the XVIIIth Dynasty, was a somewhat degenerate rococo time. In connection with the relations of Crete with the Egyptian Delta must be noticed the theory of Weill that the supposed submarine moles and other harbour works discovered by a French engineer, M. Jondet, at Alexandria, are prehistoric, and the work of Aegeans (Ha-nebu?). Sir Arthur Evans accepts Weill's view in *The Palace of Minos*, 1; but it is rejected by M. Jondet himself and by Hogarth (*Royal Geog. Soc. Journ.* 1922, p. 22 sq.), whose opinion that these moles, if they are harbour-works at all (which he doubts), are much more likely to be of Ptolemaic date seems entirely justified.

Minoans, and apparently often at war with them: we see instances of the Philistines feather-cap on the warriors of the silver vase from Mycenae and the corselet of the Shardina on the ivory mirror-handle with the Arimasp from Enkomi (p. 292). Earlier still we see the Philistine headgear on the Phaestus Disk. There is nothing Minoan or Keftian about the Phaestus Disk: its Lycian or Carian origin is assured. The classical traditions about the Carians are here of service, and we can see that the 'Peoples of the Sea' correspond remarkably to the Carian thalassocracy of tradition with which Minos the Cretan warred, according to the tradition preserved by Herodotus and Thucydides. It may be that this tradition preserves in an inaccurate form a reminiscence of early struggles between the Cretans and those 'Carians' of the Asia Minor coast who, after the fall of the Cretan thalassocracy, burst out into the piratical raids on the neighbouring coasts and islands which are mentioned in the Amarna letters and continued until the time of Ramses III.

The Minoan Keftians, then, must be sharply distinguished from the Carian and Lycian 'Peoples of the Sea,' and their allies, the Achæan Akaiwasha and others. It is therefore difficult for the present writer to accept those theories which, on the ground of the fact that the 'Peoples of the Sea' frequented the Syrian coast, would assign to them a preponderating rôle in Phœnicia, as Minoan rulers of the Semitic inhabitants, and would ascribe the Phœnician love of the sea to Keftian and Minoan influence or even blood. It seems impossible to ascribe Phœnician sea-going to 'Carians.' It must be much older than their raids, and we have no historical proof of any 'Carian' rule in the Phœnician states. In the Amarna letters the Phœnician chiefs appear to be all Semites with Semitic names, and the Shekhlal and others who frequent their ports are independent pirates or mercenaries in the pay of Egypt. Support has been sought for the theory of Minoan influence on Phœnicia in the fact that the land of Keftiu was equated by Ptolemaic historiographers with Phœnicia; but there is nothing Phœnician about the appearance of the Keftians. If they appear depicted by the Egyptians in costumes departing considerably from the Minoan fashion, and approaching that of the Syrian, this may be due either to the Cilician origin of these particular Keftians, or more simply to inaccuracy on the part of the Egyptian artists. In the earliest representations of the Keftians, those in the tomb of Rekhmire (p. 414), they are distinctly Minoan Cretans, with the characteristic coiffure of the latter, with its long tresses to the waist and fantastic curls on the

top of the head; they are completely different from that of the Semites, who never wore their hair so long or dressed in this distinctive wise. Such peculiar personal adornments and fashions of dressing the hair are, as all students of ethnology know, matters of tribal custom, and extremely important as criteria of race. In the tomb of Menkheperresenb, too, where the offerings, though badly drawn, are as clearly objects of Minoan Cretan art, as in that of Sennemut, the characteristic Cretan coiffure with its separate tresses or plaits is plain, though the kilts are not specially Cretan in character. And in Hebrew tradition Caphtor was, if not certainly identified with Crete, at all events closely associated with Cretans. It is not impossible, however, that Keftians may have lived as far east as the Cilician coast, or, more probably, that the Egyptians knew of tribes there, related to the Cretans or migrants from Crete (like those who had undoubtedly colonized Cyprus before 1450 B.C., as we know from the discoveries at Enkomi), and called them by the same name as they did the Cretans proper. This much may be conceded, although the Ptolemaic identification can only be regarded as an error. The Ptolemaic priests are hardly to be relied upon in a matter of this kind, relating to a period more than a thousand years before their time, when, as here, their statements conflict with conclusions based upon our archaeological and historical knowledge. See also p. 438.

The first mention of the name *Keftiu*, in the form *Kefatiu*, occurs in the papyrus containing the prophecies of Ipuwer, known as 'the Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage' (see vol. I, p. 344). As the original text is certainly as old as the Middle Kingdom, if not older, the mention of *Kefatiu*, unless it is an interpolation, is much older than the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty. And, in fact, there is evidence, as already mentioned, for early relations between Crete and Egypt even in the VIth Dynasty. The greatest vogue of the name, however, was within the narrow limits of a single century, between 1500 and 1400 B.C., more especially in the reign of Thutmose III. Now, this was precisely the period of the most elaborate, but already decadent, culture of Crete which we call 'Late Minoan I' at Cnossus: 'Late Minoan II,' the second period, being hardly observable as a separate epoch elsewhere in Crete or in the isles, where 'L.M. I.' changes imperceptibly to 'L.M. III.' It may be that at this time Minoan dynasts, hearing of the renown of Thutmose the conqueror, hastened to send him ambassadors with gifts. The court-poet makes Amon say in the triumphal inscription of Karnak: 'I have come: I have caused thee to smite the lands of the West: Keftiu and Asy are

in fear. I have caused them to see thy Majesty as a young bull, firm of heart, sharp-horned, unapproachable.' Thutmose, presumably, never approached Crete, or even Cilicia, in arms: but he could regard the gifts of the west as a tribute to his prestige, as indeed they were. Silver vases of Keftiu-work came to Egypt as tribute from Syria: no doubt the Cretan artists had an extensive market for their vases. Ships went direct to Keftiu from the Phoenician and Delta ports: in a Theban tomb-picture of the XVIIIth Dynasty a Phoenician ship, manned by Semites, brings Mycenaean(?) pottery to Thebes. The Keftiu-ships may have been Phoenician or Keftian, probably both: we have no proof that the Phoenicians were not permitted to trade in the Aegean even in Minoan days.

Under Amenhotep III the name occurs once, under the XIXth Dynasty twice officially—in one case in a list of subject peoples. The list is a vague and general one, of the inaccurate kind not unknown in Egypt, in which Tehennu (Libya), Naharin (Syria), Ashur (Assyria), Sangara (? Babylonia), Kheta (Anatolia), Keftiu (Crete) and Asy (? Cyprus or Asia Minor coast) are all claimed as subjects with little justification, and certainly none in the case of Kheta. No conclusion as to the precise geographical position of Keftiu can be drawn from such a conventional list. Also there are, so to speak, 'unofficial' references: the list of Keftian names on a writing-board in the British Museum (of the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty), the charm in the Kefti-language against 'the Asiatic Disease,' also in the British Museum, which is of XVIIIth–XIXth Dynasty date (though it used to be considered to be much later), the mention of a Keftian under the XIXth Dynasty, and then silence¹. The name Keftiu disappears till, the Ptolemaic historiographer says, it means Phoenicia. Does not this disappearance agree with the fact of the overthrow and disappearance of Minoan culture in the welter of the 'Peoples of the Sea'?

Whether the name Keftiu was a local appellation or of Egyptian origin we do not know. An Egyptian explanation of it as 'the Hinder-lands,' at the back of beyond, so to speak, is possible, but not proven; the earliest known form, *Kefatiu*, is in favour of it.

The name of *Asy*, associated with Keftiu under the XVIIIth Dynasty, has usually been taken to be an Egyptian mispronuncia-

¹ Another translation of the charm above mentioned would make Keftian an 'Asiatic language.' If this rendering is correct it is probably merely another instance of loose and inaccurate Egyptian description. The language quoted may, too, not be really Cretan Keftian at all, but some mock-Asiatic jargon which the Egyptian scribe called 'Keftian.'

tion of the name of the land of Alashiya as 'As'ya': later in the dynasty the more correct form *Alesa* was used. The land of Alashiya (the biblical Elishah?), introduced to us by the Amarna letters, has usually been taken to be Cyprus, where in later times an Apollo Alahiōtas or Alasiōtas was worshipped. Copper, too, was an important export from Alashiya or Alesa, as we see both from the letters and the lists. But there are serious arguments against this identification, and the coast-land of Cilicia seems as likely to have been Alashiya as Cyprus. At all events the identification of Asy with Alashiya and with Cyprus is extremely doubtful.

It is quite possible that the Egyptians of the XVIIIth Dynasty called Cyprus *Yantinai*, which would be the same as the later Assyrian name for the island, *Yatnana*; and *Asy* would seem rather to be the mainland of Asia Minor, perhaps west of Cilicia and Alashiya, and the name may simply be 'Asia' itself. Neither Asy nor Alashiya is mentioned after the XIXth Dynasty. Another name contemporary with Keftiu is that of the western isles of *Utentiu*; but it is quite uncertain whether this is the Libyan coast, or a hint of Sicily and Italy, or even a misunderstanding of the name Tinay or Yantinai (Cyprus).

Of the 'Peoples of the Sea,' not associated with the Keftians, the earliest to be mentioned are the *Shardina*, *Shekhla*, *Danuna* and *Lukka* or *Luka*, who first appear in the Amarna letters. The fact that the name of Keftiu does not once occur in them makes it unlikely that it was Cilicia. The Shekhla (? Shakalsha) and probably the Shardina are Egyptian mercenaries; the Luka are raiders and spoilers on the Phoenician coast. Danuna is a land at peace (p. 322). The last name is uncertain, but has been identified with the biblical Dodanim and the Greek Danai. The supposed mention of Yivana, i.e. Ionians, in one of the letters is no longer maintained.

Next, in the reign of Ramses II we have the allies of the Hatti in the war with Egypt (p. 141): *Luka*, *Pidasa*, *Masa*, *Dardenui*, *Iliunna* (?), *Kalikisha* and *Mushant*. There is no doubt that these allies of the Hittites lived in Anatolia, and it is still a legitimate conclusion that these peoples were Lycians, Pisidians (or Pedasians?), Mysians, Dardanians, Ilians (?) and Cilicians—we cannot identify the Mushant. The name Iliunna has otherwise been read (a) *Ari-unna* and identified with Oroanda, or (b) *Maunna* and identified with Maconia, or (c) *Yewanna* and identified with Yāwān (Ἰάων), the Ionians. Since the supposed mention of Yivana in the Amarna letters is to be rejected, in spite of the tempting nature of the identification with the Ionian name, it is much more probable

philologically that Ilion and the Trojans are meant. Excavation has certainly shown us that Ilion existed then, and had existed for centuries before as an important town. The Dardenui can only have been Dardanians, whether they were then in the Troad or not, and this being so, the Iliunna or Iriunna are naturally Ilians, and the Masa probably Mysians of the Hellespontine region. That the Luka were Lycians is evident from their mention both here and in the Amarna letters, where they appear as piratical raiders of Alashiya. Their name is no doubt native, and does not show that there were then in the Mediterranean Aryan Greeks who handed their name on to the Egyptians in a Greek form as 'wolf-folk' (λύκος), appropriate, no doubt, though that appellation would have been. The only name, however, by which, as we learn from their inscriptions, they knew themselves is *Trmmlī* (*Τρυμλί*, *Τερμίλαι*). Cf. p. 9.

The Luka reappear in the alliance of the sea-peoples with the Libyan Mashawasha or Maxyes in the reign of Merneptah (c. 1225 B.C.), and associated with them were *Shardina*, *Shakalsha*, *Tursha* and *Akaiwasha*, 'Northerners coming from all lands.' It is noticeable that (if the word *karnata* means 'foreskin,' and not simply penis-sheath, 'codpiece') they are specially described as uncircumcised. Here we meet with the *Shardina* and *Shakalsha*, not as mercenaries, but as enemies, and with them the *Tursha*. It was natural that these three should have been identified as Sardinians, Sikels and Tyrsenians, and that the *Akaiwasha* should have been hailed as Achaeans. And although the *Shakalsha* are more probably Sagalassians of Pisidia than Sikels, the *Shardina* and *Tursha* were, in a sense, Sardinians and Tyrsenians. That is to say, they were, as Maspero brilliantly surmised, Sardinians and Tyrsenians on the way to and not yet settled in Sardinia and Italy: Sardinians from Sardes and Tursci from Lydia—the Tyrsenians who emigrated from Asia Minor to Italy, as Herodotus tells us and as archaeology testifies. It is remarkable how tradition, archaeological evidence and Egyptian historical data thus agree in confirming this origin of Etruscan civilization in Asia Minor and the probable racial kinship of the Etruscans to the Hittites.

As for the all-interesting *Akaiwasha*, what especially puzzled the classical scholar was the suffix *-sha*. This was explained for the first time in 1901 by the present writer as the Asianic ethnic suffix known in Lycian as *-aza* or *-azi* (the town name-termination *-ασσος* as in *Sagalassos*), while the *-na* suffix was shown to be the other Asianic ethnic suffix *-nna* (the town name-termination *-νδα*, as in *Oroanda*); cf. p. 16. He was followed in this conclusion

three years later by Weill, who subsequently drew attention to another explanation which would make Akaiwash(a) the same as Ἀχαιῶς, with an old nominative plural in -ως. The Egyptian word may well have been vocalized *Akaiwōsh*; but the other explanation seems more probable, and is generally accepted. The equation of the Greek χ with *k* or *g* apparently presents no difficulty since we have the reverse equation in the Assyrian *Khilakku*—Κίλικες; and it must be remembered that the early Greek χ was not a guttural *h* but an aspirated *k* (i.e. *k* + *h*). Such an aspirate could easily be omitted in a foreign transcription of a name.

On these grounds, therefore, it is by no means beyond the bounds of probability that the Akaiwasha who invaded Egypt in the reign of Merneptah were really of the race of the Achaeans, who now make their first appearance in history as a small band of chance rovers, 'fighting to fill their bellies daily,' as the Egyptian record pithily puts it.

II. THE PHILISTINE MIGRATION

The next mention of the sea-tribes is thirty years later, in the great invasion of c. 1194 B.C., at the beginning of the reign of Ramses III (p. 173). This appears to have been a veritable folk-wandering, coming both by land and sea from the Aegean Isles and southern coasts of Asia Minor round by Cyprus and the Gulf of Issus to Phoenicia and Syria, thence down the coast, possibly to the very border of Egypt, where the Pharaoh met and defeated the migrating tribes in the Serbonian marshes. In this fight Shardina fought Shardina; for some were among the Egyptian huscarles, and others were free vikings. There were Tursha, too, on the Egyptian side. Besides *Shardina*, the barbarian host consisted of *Pulesati* (*Purasati*), *Washasha*, *Zakaray* (*Zakkal*), *Shakalsha*, and the *Daanau* or *Danaua*, whom we perhaps know already as frequenters of the Phoenician coast, nearly two centuries before¹.

¹ As this is uncertain (see p. 281) the Danuna may be a new appearance altogether. The Egyptian authorities for the names are the inscriptions of Ramses III at Medinet Habu and the 'Great Harris Papyrus.' Prof. Breasted, it has been seen, regards the fighting as having taken place on the Phoenician coast (p. 174 sq.). The *Washasha* have been identified with Oassians of Caria by Maspero, with men of Issus on the Syrian coast by Sayce, and, by the present writer, with the Oaxians or *Fáξιοι* of Crete. These people came from farther off than the Gulf of Issus, where the Egyptians placed the land of Kode, and where probably was the Kissuwadna of the Egyptian and Hittite records (S. Smith, *Journ. Eg. Arch.* 1922, p. 45 sq.). There is

Despite all the uncertainties, these tribes were evidently westerners, and cannot well have come from anywhere much east of the Aegean. The *Shakalsha* may have been Pisidians of Sagalassus. The *Pulesati* were clearly a people of the south-west corner of the Asiatic mainland, like the Luka, men with the distinctive armour and feather-crest of the Lycians and Carians, and of the same race as the latter. According to the Egyptian record, 'The Isles were restless, disturbed among themselves at one and the same time. No land stood before them, beginning from Kheta (Cappadocia), Kedi (the "circling" of the Syrian coast at the Gulf of Issus), Carchemish, Arvad and Alashiya. They destroyed them, and assembled in their camp in the midst of Amor (Palestine).' Evidently the whole of Syria was overrun as far as the Euphrates by the land-horde, while the ship-men kept along the coast, overwhelming Alashiya on the way. Then a halt was called in southern Syria until, no doubt, everything around had been eaten up; and, pressure from behind increasing, the mass began to roll forward again towards Egypt, with the result we already know.

What caused this migration, very different from the previous fights with the Hittite allies or attacks by pirate squadrons, we do not know. It might with some probability be assigned to the invasion of the Bryges or Phrygians from Thrace, who may have crossed the Hellespont about this time and carved out for themselves a land from the possessions of the Anatolians. The great kingdom of Hatti now fell, whether, as the Egyptians thought, before the Philistines and their allies, who would be retreating before the Phrygians, or, as is more probable, before the direct attack of the Phrygians themselves. The displaced peoples of the Aegean shore and the *hinterland* of Lycia, Caria and Pamphylia, would naturally take their way eastward farther south along the coast of Cilicia.

It would seem that the *Pulesati* and their allies, baulked in their attempt to overrun Egypt, settled down in the Shephelah, where we find the *Pēlishtim* a century or so later contending with the Israelites. It is from the references to these Philistines in the biblical tradition that we realize their character as alien invaders, entirely foreign^a to the Semites, and see how inevitable is the conclusion that they were identical with the *Pulesati* of Egyptian

no room for these tribes so near as the north Syrian coast. *Zakaray* used to be identified with the *Τεύκροι*, but the *v* is a difficulty, and Petrie suggested that they might be men of *Zakro* in Crete: the name, though not mentioned by classical writers, may be very old.

history. Of their allies the Zakaray alone reappear, nearly a century later, settled farther north, at Dor (p. 380); the rest disappear. From a reference in the Harris Papyrus it would appear that the Washasha were left behind and enslaved in Egypt. The non-Semitic name Ziklag may, if textually correct, be connected with the Zakaray (Zakkal), or even with the Shakalsha. The place lay in the 'Negeb of the Kērēthim,' south of Philistia proper, but it is quite possible that these tribes themselves split up after their defeat and escape (cf. p. 175).

The biblical 'Chērēthites' is apparently synonymous with 'Philistines.' 'Woe,' cries Zephaniah (ii, 5 *sq.*), 'to the people of the sea-coast, the folk of the Kerethim! The word of Yahweh is against thee, O Canaan, land of the Philistines, and I shall destroy thee that thou shalt have no inhabitant. And Kereth (so we should read) shall be dwellings for shepherds and folds for flocks!' By Ezekiel, too (xxv, 16), the Philistines and the Kerethim are included in a common denunciation. Elsewhere the *Kērēthī*, or Cherethites, are mentioned as huscarles of king David, with the *Pēlēthī* or 'Pelethites,' who may simply be Philistines, the form (with the otherwise inexplicable omission of the *sh*) being framed in order to produce an assonance between the names. Now the name Kērēthī (Kerethim or Cherethim) is translated by 'Cretans' in the Greek version of the passages from Zephaniah and Ezekiel mentioned above: in classical days the inhabitants of the Palestinian coast were certainly of opinion that they were of Cretan origin, and the idea was generally accepted by the rest of the world. For example, we find it in Tacitus, who, however, confuses the Jews with the Philistines¹. Gaza, where Samson brought the pillars of the temple to the ground upon the lords of the Philistines, was in Roman times called Minoa, and its god Marnas ('our Lord') was considered to be the same as Zeus Krētagēnēs (Velchanos), the Minoan-Carian Zeus of the double-axe who was born on Ida, nourished on Dicte and who died on Iuctas. Such traditions can hardly be regarded as the result of a Ptolemaic or Roman antiquarianism, based on the resemblance of the name of Crete to that of Cherethim, which persisted. There are other connections between the Philistines and Crete besides the name of Kērēthī, which obviously means Crete when taken in conjunction with the other evidence; though if it stood alone we might regard it as a mere coincidence, in which case Kērēthī and Pēlēthī would have nothing to do with 'the Peoples of the Sea.'

¹ 'Iudaeos Creta insula profugos nouissima Libyae insedissee memorant, qua tempestate Saturnus ui Iouis pulsus cesserit regnis' (*Hist.* v, 2).

The name and identity of the biblical Caphtor now come into consideration. 'Have I not brought Israel out of Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor?' says Amos (ix, 7). It would be useless to recapitulate here all the arguments for and against the identity of Caphtor with Crete, since the days of Brugsch's first acceptance of the equation in 1859. Much of the argument in favour of the identification rests, of course, upon the identity of *Keftiu* with Crete. The name of Keftiu has naturally been identified with Caphtor, in spite of the final *r* (which however has been explained away by Egyptian philologists). The Keftians, described as such in the tomb of Rekhmire at Thebes, are Minoan Cretans, whether they were identical with 'the Men of the Isles' or not. And presumably the Minoans of the tombs of Sennemut and Menkheperresenb are Keftians and Cretans too. We cannot assert that the name Keftians was given by the Egyptians to the kindred (Minoan or semi-Minoan) peoples who, as we have seen, *may* have lived as far east as Cilicia, although there is no archaeological proof that they *did*. The Minoans of Cyprus would no doubt be Keftians. They were migrants from Crete. It is therefore most natural to regard Caphtor and Keftiu as Crete. In view of the name Kereth and the classical traditions of Philistia it would seem probable that to the Hebrews Caphtor meant Crete. From there they came to Palestine. 'And the Avvim, who dwelt in villages as far as Gaza, the Caphtorim, who had come forth out of Caphtor, destroyed them and dwelt in their stead' (Deut. ii, 23). In the book of Jeremiah (xlvii, 4) a prophecy against the Philistines declares that Yahweh 'destroyeth the Philistines, the remainder of the sea-shore (or isle) of Caphtor.'

There is however a serious difficulty in accepting this conclusion without modification. The Philistines were not Keftians or Minoans, nor were the Shardina, Tursha, or Shakalsha. Like the Shardina and the rest, they did not wear the Minoan or Keftian dress. They apparently wore laminated body-armour. The Minoan is never represented wearing any, even when fighting, but as cuirasses are depicted on the hieroglyphic tablets of Cnossus, this cannot be pressed. The Keftian comes to Egypt as a peaceful ambassador, and naturally does not wear armour. The Philistine carried, not the typical double-bossed shield, like the figure 8, which the Minoan and Mycenaean used, but a smaller round shield, like that of the Shardina. Also he used, not the rapier-like thrusting Minoan blade, but a great cutting broadsword, also like the Shardina. Finally, his headdress was altogether different. He wore a high feather-crest (the *λόφος* of the Greeks,

the *magidūta* of the Assyrians) like that of the Carians and Lydians, beneath which no hair is visible. From the heads on the Phaestus Disk, which certainly represent people of the same race as the Philistines, it would seem as though the head were shaven, a fashion in direct contrast to the unshorn tresses of the Minoan-Keftian men.

Hence, the Philistine was very different in appearance from the Minoan or Keftian of Crete. He lived at a later time, it is true, but we know from the Phaestus Disk that his appearance was the same in Middle Minoan days as in that of Ramses III, when the Late Minoan period was nearing its end, and the great days of Cnossus were past. We do not see him in the Cretan representations of Minoan Cretans. He appears, probably as an enemy of the Minoans, on the silver vase from Mycenae with the well-known siege-scene embossed upon it, and here he carries, apparently, a rectangular shield resembling a Roman shape (see p. 452). Where he came from in reality is evident from his costume. With the Shardina and Tursha (the latter wear a similar feathered head-dress) he came from the south-west angle of Asia Minor (p. 282). The Shardina was on his way from Sardes to Sardo, the Tursha from Lydia to Etruria. It is possible enough that, at the breakdown of Cnossian power and the eclipse of Minoan civilization, the Carian tribes, among them the Philistines, may have occupied the eastern end of Crete; and if Caphtor is to be confined rigidly to Crete, we must suppose that they came to Palestine *via* Crete. But in all probability Caphtor is not to be confined solely to Crete, but meant Crete and, in general, the other islands and lands in its vicinity, Caria and Lycia included. If so, since Caphtor can hardly be other than identical with Keftiu, the latter name may have meant, also, to the Egyptian, not necessarily Crete only, but the neighbouring isles and lands to the eastward, though the Keftian proper (the inhabitant of the real Caphtor) was to the Egyptian a Minoan, which the Philistine was not. It may be observed that one of the parallels between Keftiu and the Philistines is the Philistine name Achish (the biblical form) or Ikaushu (Assyrian records), and this is rightly compared with the Akashau (vocalized by some as 'Ekosh') which occurs in the Egyptian list of Keftian names, already mentioned (p. 280). In the Septuagint, Achish is Ἀγχούς, and the name is no doubt the same as the famous Trojan Anchises: *i.e.* it is an Asia Minor rather than a Cretan name.

Thus we perceive that tradition brought the Philistines approximately from their real home. The fact that the Caphtorim,

from whom the Philistines came forth (so we should read in Gen. x, 14) are 'children of Mizraim' is evidently merely a political figure: the Philistines were historically tributaries of Egypt after their defeat, at all events until the time of David, and no doubt their later political leanings were generally Egyptian. Accordingly, the Caphtorim (and Caslukhim) from whom they sprang were also regarded as politically akin to Egypt. To take the reference in any other than a political sense seems impossible; we cannot regard the Philistines as having come forth out of Egypt, except in so far as they did so when they were ejected pell-mell by Ramses III, presumably from the Delta (see p. 283, and note 1, above). That they really came from Lycia and Caria is, as we have seen, the only view we can take.

The question now arises, If the Philistines were not Cretans at all, how are we to account for the classical traditions of Cretan connection? Although there was undoubtedly a distinction between the Aegean and the Carian races, to which the Philistines must have belonged, one does not as yet know that it was a fundamental one. On the contrary, the relationship, between what we know of Minoan religion and that of Anatolia forbids us to suppose that there need have been much difference between Cretan religious beliefs and customs and those of Lycia and Caria (p. 95q.). Were not the gods of the bull and the double-axe as much at home at Labraunda in Caria as in the Labyrinth of Cnossus? With the Minotaur went Minos, and, given a traditional identification of Caphtor with Crete, it would easily be possible for Minoan traditions to appear at Askalon or Gaza, and for the latter place to receive the name Minoa. Derceto or Atargatis no doubt had her close analogues in Caria and Lycia as well as in Crete. And not only do we find Cretan traditions in Philistia: the legend of Perseus and Andromeda, which was located there, is connected with Lycia, not with Crete. The Carian-Aegean element in the religion and the traditions of the Philistine coast is evident, and such an element would easily come to be regarded as Cretan. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the *Zakaray* (or *Zakkal*) and the *Washasha* have both been regarded as genuine Cretan tribes, though their allies were not. We have, unfortunately, no representations of them to show whether they wore Minoan dress. But a genuine Cretan element among the allies is not to be excluded, and is no doubt responsible for the name of the Kērēthi or Cherethim, who ought perhaps to be distinguished from the Philistines proper, the 'Pēlēthi.'

III. THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PHILISTINES IN CANAAN

The Cretan-Carian colony in Palestine seems thus sufficiently assured to be regarded as a historical fact. Although after the rise of the kingdom of Israel it ceased to be powerful as a political entity, yet the foreign blood long remained distinguishable, and marked off the inhabitants of the 'coast of the Caphtorim' as distinct from the other men of Canaan. Unless we are to understand that a local Semitic dialect is meant, the language continued to be distinct at Ashdod until the time of Nehemiah (xiii, 24). This would find a parallel in the survival of Eteocretan in the east of Crete until the fourth and third centuries B.C., as we know from the inscriptions of Praesus. Achish (Ikaushu) and other Philistine-Keftian names occur in the eighth century Assyrian records; but the rest are Semitic, and it is inherently probable that any exclusiveness that may have prevailed at first eventually broke down, and that by the time of Nehemiah, although Ashdod may have preserved its speech, and although the name of Kereth and the Kerethim still persisted on the coast, the rest of Philistia spoke Semitic, and the people were indistinguishable from the Semites around them. On the other hand, we must not forget that the coast-land of Palestine was always exposed to strangers from the Mediterranean lands (see pp. 302 *sq.*, 379).

Certainly the place-names and the gods of the conquered country were taken over without objection by the conquerors. The same thing has recurred so far as place and river names are concerned, especially the latter, in Great Britain. And in the ancient world the gods of the land remained always the gods of the land. In the west they have become gnomes and kobolds, phucas, pixies and fairies. In Canaan the Philistine took over the Baal of Gaza, later identified with Zeus Krētagenēs (Velchanos), the Baal-zebul of Ekron, the Astarte (Ashtōreth) of Beth-shean, the Derceto or Atargatis of Askalon (evidently identified with Dictynna or Britomartis), and the Dagon of Gaza and Ashdod, who was apparently a Semitic Canaanite god (see vol. I, p. 232). Dagon was no importation of the sea-rovers from the west, though he may have been identified by them with their ἄλιος γέρων, Nereus or Triton, or the Poseidon of the Ionians himself.

R. A. S. Macalister has noted that temples of some size are first mentioned in the Bible in connection with the Philistines, and one might regard the temple as one of their foreign ideas which they brought into the land, but for the fact of the other and older

influences of Babylon and Egypt. The present writer has observed that the theatre or rather the 'theatral area,' as Sir Arthur Evans calls it, which was so marked a feature of the palaces of Cnossus and Phaestus, seems to have been introduced by the Philistines, together with the gladiatorial games that took place in it, to judge from the biblical account of the exhibition of Samson in the temple of Gaza (Judg. xvi, 27): 'Now the house was full of men and women; and all the tyrants of the Philistines were there; and there were upon the roof about three thousand men and women, that beheld while Samson made sport.' The passage almost gives one a shock, when one remembers the Cnossian fresco of the Cretan lords and ladies, with the crowds of men and women, intermixed in this un-Semitic wise that the Jewish writer emphasizes purposely, represented, in summary outline, no doubt as looking on at the sports of the boxing and bull-grappling (ταυροκαθαρία). The suggestion has also been made that these brutal sports spread among the Hebrews, as when in 2 Sam. ii, 14, the young men arise to play before Abner and Joab: 'and they caught every one his fellow by the head, and thrust his sword in his fellow's side: so that they fell down together.' This is strongly reminiscent of the scenes on the famous 'Boxer Vase' from Hagia Triada in Crete¹.

On the whole, however, we find little trace of Philistine influence in Hebrew religion or in other branch of culture. Various attempts have been made to discover Greek words in Hebrew which have come in through the Philistines, but they break down on the probability that the Philistines did not speak Greek, but Lycian or Carian. One can doubtfully regard *séren* (*sarn*), the title of the Philistine city-chiefs, as the same word as *tyrant* (τύραννος), only on the supposition—very probable in itself—that this word was borrowed from the older Aegean pre-Hellenic speech. *Caphsôr*, meaning a crown or chaplet and so a pillar-capital, recalls *caput*, *capital*. But in the present state of our knowledge it is unwise to speculate upon connections between Hebrew, Aegean and other languages (see above, pp. 12 sqq., 253). A word like *pillégesh*, 'concubine' (παλλακίς, *pellex*), is obviously only a later loan-word.

Political ideas in Palestine seem to have owed as little to the invaders, who do not appear to have contributed anything new to Semitic culture in this respect. Confederations of cities were no new thing in Syria; and we cannot say that the political organization of the Philistines is more distinctly reminiscent of Greek than of Semitic culture. They took over the Canaanite

¹ See Hall, *Ancient History of Near East*, p. 418.

cities, apparently retaining their old names, and five of them (Gaza, Askalon, Gath, Ashdod and Ekron) formed an alliance or Pentapolis, as it would be called in Greece, each city under its own *séren*. There was no overlord, but apparently the *séren* of Gath, who is called 'king,' was president of the confederation. Two other towns were probably founded by the invaders themselves: Ziklag (see p. 285), and Lydda (Ludd), which does not happen to be mentioned in the older Egyptian lists of Canaanite towns, and perhaps is the same name as the Cretan Lyttos, meaning 'hill,' or may be a settlement of Ludim from Lydia, though no Lydians are mentioned in the Egyptian record. Macalister instances Beth-car as possibly meaning 'House of the Carian': this may or may not be a re-naming. Other old native towns which were not members of the Pentapolis were also important Philistine centres, as Beth-shemesh, while Beth-shean, away in the Jordan valley, commanding the entrance to the plain of Esdraelon, was Philistine at the death of Saul (1 Sam. xxxi).

The organization of the Philistine was a military one. They were hated invaders, uncircumcised foreigners, and they knew that their existence depended on the repression of the older inhabitants, so far as these had not moved out of their pale. We see what a strangle-hold they kept upon the hill-country of Judah and Israel until their power was broken by David. For the history we have to rely wholly upon the biblical narratives. From these it would seem that for a century the Philistines remained more or less quiescent in their newly-occupied territory, and their confederated state gradually took form. Then came the period of warlike domination over southern Palestine between the battles of Ebenezer, when the Ark was captured in the days of Samuel, and David's victory at Baal-perazim (2 Sam. v). Subsequently we have the appearance of the warriors of the Philistines and Cherethites as mercenary guards of the Jewish king, just as the Shardina had served Pharaoh in the past. Mercenary service was as characteristic of the tribes of southern and western Anatolia then as it was in later times: the Carian or Pisidian was the Swiss of ancient history. See below, p. 380 *sq.*

During the period of Philistine 'oppression,' we are told, the conquered people was disarmed: 'there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel: for the Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears' (1 Sam. xiii, 19). This was a very remarkable precaution to take, and amid much that is difficult in the biblical narrative, we need not doubt the historical character of the statement. It is the more interesting because it

probably means that the Hebrews were forbidden to forge any weapons of *iron*, not bronze. The use of iron was now making its way swiftly in the ancient world, and the edge of the iron weapon was being felt on the battlefield. The Palestinian and Syrian wars of the XVIIIth Dynasty had been fought by Egyptians and Syrians who used bronze weapons exclusively. In the time of Ramses II iron is beginning to appear in the armament of Egypt's enemies. We can see that it is very probable that the dubious success of the Egyptians in their Hittite wars was at least partly due to the possession of the new and more efficient weapon by the northerners. The Egyptians were very desirous of acquiring iron, the lack of which considerably handicapped them. We find Ramses himself negotiating for iron with a Hittite king, who diplomatically puts him off with what was probably a lie, that there was no iron-working going on in Kissuwadna at the time (cf. pp. 272, 524). The Shardina, as mercenaries or enemies, still used bronze blades, as also did the Philistines at first. But at the time of the struggle with David we have traditions that their offensive armament was of iron. Goliath's spearhead was of iron. The mention of iron might be regarded as an interpolation, but it is probable enough that by the beginning of the tenth century B.C. their bronze weapons had finally given way to iron. Meanwhile, it would be an obvious precaution on their part to prevent the Israelites from forging weapons of the new and dangerous metal. Defensive armour was still of bronze.

It has often been noted how European was the armour of Goliath, with its helmet and scale-cuirass of bronze, and, especially, the greaves of bronze (*χαλκοκνήμιδες*), things entirely unknown to the Egyptian or Syrian warrior, and specifically Greek. De Rougé thought that he had discovered greaves in the description of the Akaiwasha, which would have been a notable discovery: they would indeed have been 'well-greaved Achaeans' (*ἐὺκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί*). But the Egyptian word in question properly means a kind of knife or razor. The Philistine however was greaved, and in this connection there is great interest in the pair of bronze greaves of about this period (about twelfth–tenth century B.C.), the oldest Greek greaves known, that were found at Enkomi in Cyprus. Goliath, indeed, must have been conceived as looking very like the griffin-slaying Arimaspiān on the ivory mirror-handle from Enkomi, whose dress is absolutely that of the Shardina and Pulesati of the Egyptian monuments (p. 278). The shield is not mentioned, but we can imagine it 'like a tower' (*ὡς πύργος*), completing the Homeric picture. There is no doubt that the armoured

warrior from the west impressed his memory indelibly on the minds of the Hebrews.

In a word, the Philistine is a curious parallel to the mailed western crusader of later times; but in spite of their prowess the East vanquished them both, and the defeat of western dominion at the Horns of Hattin in 1187 A.D. was in this respect an inevitable repetition of Baal-perazim.

Actual relics, other than pottery, of the stay of these exotic conquerors of early days are not many in Syria and Palestine. An important find has been made in the Lebanon, by C. L. Woolley, of late-Mycenaean graves with pottery which can only be regarded as relics of the occupation of Amor of which the Egyptian records speak (p. 174). It has also been supposed that the camps of Mishrifeh, near Homs, and Tell Sefinet Nuh are those of the Philistines and their allies 'in the midst of Amor.' It has been objected that such camps were entirely foreign to Anatolians and Aegeans, and that the theory of these being Philistine is quite impossible. But there is no proof whatever that camps of the kind were not as well known to Anatolians and Aegeans as to Syrians. A much more valid argument is that the Philistines and their allies hardly maintained themselves long enough in central Syria to be able to build such camps. We may be well advised, therefore, in not claiming them as actual relics of the Philistines, though of course they may have been occupied by them on their way south¹.

In the south there are signs of Aegean architecture in certain buildings at Gezer and at Tell es-Safi (Gath), which have the characteristic Cretan light-well. The supposed Philistine graves discovered by Macalister at Gezer are, in all probability, Philistine, but of a comparatively late period. It seems difficult to date them earlier than about 800 B.C. The foreign burial customs were evidently still kept up. It is remarkable that so few traces of definitely Aegean burials have been found. One reason probably is that the Philistines largely burnt their dead, following the new northern custom that had come in with the Age of Iron. Their pottery is of the late or sub-Mycenaean type associated in Greece with incineration.

The most important relic of the foreign domination is the quantity of this native-made pottery, imitating the Mycenaean,

¹ There seems to be no particular reason for supposing these camps to be of Hyksos origin, or anything else but native Syrian or Hittite (Anatolian), unless, of course, as is probable enough, the Hyksos were themselves simply North Syrians in the main.

that has been found at Gezer, Tell es-Saft, 'Ain Shems (Beth-shemesh) and Askalon¹. Much imported Minoan, Mycenaean, and Cyprian pottery has also been found, dating mostly from the pre-Philistine period. This need not, and in the case of the Minoan ware obviously does not, belong to the Philistines, but could be imported by the Canaanites as it was by the Egyptians. During the period of occupation it no doubt was also imported by the Philistines. But the local imitation of Mycenaean pottery stands on a different footing. It is evidently the manufacture of a population accustomed to pottery of Aegean shape and decoration, and desirous of continuing its own style. This 'sub-Mycenaean' ware, which we may call definitely Philistine, is very characteristic of the town-strata of this period, and may be dated about 1200-1000 B.C. We find close parallels to its decoration and form in the latest Mycenaean ceramic styles from Palaikastro, near Zakro, at the eastern end of Crete. This is perhaps significant, if the Zakaray came thence (p. 284 n.), and if the Philistines were in eastern Crete before they passed on eastwards. Similar ware has also been found in Crete at Phaestus, in Cyprus, at Assarlik in Caria, in the island of Calymnus and elsewhere, with the same characteristic late-Mycenaean 'bird' and 'metope' motives of decoration, and of the same forms. In Greece this latest Mycenaean ware is already associated with the use of iron and the practice of burning the dead.

We are, therefore, entirely justified, on grounds of tradition and of archaeological discovery, in regarding the Philistines as

¹ Unfortunately, before the foreign origin of this local pottery was realized, Bliss and Macalister had described it in *Excavations in Palestine* as 'Palestinian' of the pre-Israelite period, and in *Gezer* Macalister still (1912) speaks of it as belonging to the 'Second Semitic period.' This ambiguous term does not, however, mean that he conceives it as made by Semites; he recognizes its Mycenaean character. The pottery in *Excavations*, plates 35-44, and *Gezer*, plate clxii, for instance, is ordinary late-Mycenaean. The coloured plate, *Gezer*, no. clxiii, shows the distinction between the sub-Mycenaean 'Philistine' and the native 'Amorite' styles, which are both represented. Dr Duncan Mackenzie, in his reports on Beth-shemesh, definitely settled the status of this ware as Philistine, and Prof. Macalister agrees (*The Philistines*, p. 122). This pottery, indeed, would by itself be sufficient to prove the Aegean origin of the Philistines. It is difficult to connect the Philistine pottery with the Achaeans (Phythian-Adams, Jerusalem School of Archaeology, *Bulletin* 3, 1923) without considering first other possible relationships, and the direct derivation of the Philistines from the Balkan-Danubian region with the Achaeans (*ib.*) finds a difficulty in the appearance of Philistines on the Phaestus disk in the Middle Minoan period, not later than 1600 B.C.

Mediterraneans of Lycian-Carian origin, who passed, very possibly after a temporary occupation of eastern Crete, along the Asia Minor coast as part of a regular folk-wandering caused by the Phrygian invasion, till they reached Palestine, where, after their defeat at the hands of Ramses III, they settled in the historical Philistia.

The latest mention in any Egyptian record of the Peoples of the Sea, as such, is that of the settlement of Zakaray at Dor, in the report of Wenamon (p. 192). In all probability, however, the Philistine name occurs later as the Egyptian equivalent of Παλαιστίνη (= Philistia) as in the inscription of Petisis, 'messenger to Canaan and Pulesati' under the XXVIth Dynasty (probably in the reign of Apries or Amasis), which is now in a French private collection¹. Here we have the old name of the Purasati or Pulesati used as the definite name of part of Palestine: the Egyptians themselves thus testify that the Philistines were the Purasati and that the name of Palestine is derived from that of this wandering tribe from the Aegean.

¹ M. Chassinat, the original publisher of this inscription in *Bull. Inst. Fr. Caire*, I (1901), pp. 98-100, was in error in dating it to the time of Shishak and the XXIInd Dynasty. Its Saïte date is obvious from the name Petisis, and from its style and that of the figure on which it is cut. The only question is whether the name *P-r-s-t* in it does not refer to Persia, rather than to Philistia, and whether its spelling has not been contaminated by the resemblance in hieroglyphs to the old name of Purasati (see Hall, in *Mélanges Champollion*, 1922, p. 325, n. 3). But it is more probable that the old name is actually meant, and was no doubt in general use for Philistia, *Kanana* (Canaan) meaning the inland country of Judah and Israel.

CHAPTER XIII

SYRIA AND PALESTINE IN THE LIGHT OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

THE history of Syria and Palestine during the sixteenth to eleventh centuries is very largely that of the great surrounding powers whose fortunes have already been described. It is not until we approach the last quarter of the second millennium B.C. that external conditions favour the rise of those independent states which become known to us as Damascus, Israel, Judah, Moab, Edom, etc. But our knowledge of these lands is fragmentary and uncertain; for, although the Old Testament contains the Israelites' own views of the past, any account of the internal conditions must be based upon the 'external' sources. Old ideas of Egypt and south-west Asia have been revolutionized, partly by the Amarna letters (p. 128) and the cuneiform tablets found at Boghaz Keui (p. 253), and partly by the results of excavation in Palestine and Syria (vol. 1, pp. 130-134). In the 'tells' of Syria and Palestine—still only very slightly examined—there is material so extensive and so significant that any attempt to describe these lands must be made only with the utmost caution. However, there is already a considerable amount of evidence, direct and indirect, from the 'tells,' and from Egyptian, Babylonian, Hittite and other sources, and it permits us to supplement what has been said in the foregoing chapters, and to secure a starting-point for the investigation of other and far from contemporary sources (*viz.* in the Old Testament).

When Egypt expelled the Hyksos the early interrelations already illustrated in the Romance of Sinuhe (vol. 1, p. 227 *sq.*) were renewed with increased vigour, and Syria and Palestine came more or less continuously within the ambit of Egyptian politics. South Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula tended to gravitate towards Egypt; and a strong Egypt always exerted influence eastwards of the Delta. In the north, however, the tendency was towards Syria, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor; and the general historical situation has much in common with that, centuries later, when Egypt contended with Assyria and Ptolemies with Seleucids to possess the same debatable country. The

physical characteristics of the area have already been described (p. 55 *sq.*). The issue lay between a powerful Egypt struggling, from the time of Thutmose I onward, to extend her power into south-western Asia, and movements from the north, sweeping down, and endeavouring to maintain themselves, not in Egypt itself, as did the Hyksos, but at the very gates of Egypt. On the whole, Egypt found it not too difficult to seize Palestine and south Syria; and then her armies could even be safely transferred to Phoenician ports, as a base for the more serious struggles in the Phoenician *hinterland* and north Syria. Here, in the district of Kadesh on the Orontes (see pp. 56 *sq.*, 74 *sq.*), and farther north, towards Mitanni (pp. 58, 67), Egypt faced more strenuous foes, and encountered powerful coalitions which, indeed, in the time of Thutmose III, once-reached as far south as Megiddo. North Syria, with its central position, its native wealth, and its trading intercourse, was the natural link between Egypt, Asia Minor, and Assyria and Babylonia; it was a gateway, a land to be secured as the starting-point for attack; and the fact that Mitanni was also a buffer-state gives it special importance during the period now under survey (cf. pp. 67, 230, 264).

I. THE AMARNA AGE: HATTI AND MITANNI

The letters from Amarna and Boghaz Keui reveal an internationalism, even a certain cosmopolitanism, the extent of which is still only imperfectly known (cf. above, pp. 94, 231). The great powers were in constant communication: they wrote to one another as 'brothers,' they mourned deaths, and they announced or congratulated new accessions. They made elaborate defensive and offensive alliances, and sealed them by intermarriages, taking care, where necessary, to safeguard the position of their married daughters. As occasion demanded, a famous physician would be sent, or a divining-priest, and once, indeed, a renowned builder. Rich presents were given, and boldly demanded—Egypt was notoriously rich in gold—and a letter without a present could be almost a diplomatic incident. They closely scrutinized the quality of the gifts and took notice of the treatment of the messengers—some of whom were veritable ambassadors; they kept a jealous eye, too, upon the frequency of these visits, and saw that they were made with proper state. Thus, the Babylonian king Burnaburiash (Burraburiash) found it disgraceful that Amen-hotep IV (Ikhnaton) sent only five chariots to conduct his daughter to Egypt. The messengers and caravans, passing to and fro,

demanding regular routes, and it was frequently necessary to protect them from unruly clans or lawless desert-tribes. Attacks upon caravans were likely to hinder regular intercourse, and therefore friendly relations. Hence an armed escort might be necessary (cf. also *Ezr.* viii, 21 *sq.*). Trading-relations along the routes would generate a certain political cohesion; but the paths of peace were also those of war, and important trading-tribes might also be dangerous raiders (cf. Midian, *Gen.* xxxvii, *Judg.* vi, *sqq.*). Caravan-leaders readily became men of considerable authority—Mohammed himself was one—and the more important trading-posts could form nuclei of a far-reaching 'empire,' as, e.g., when the oasis of Palmyra in the third century A.D. could exert influence into Egypt and west Asia Minor, and stand up against Rome herself.

The importance of Ikhnaton's city of Amarna and of the Amarna letters entitles us to speak of the 'Amarna Age' as a well-defined landmark. The letters belong to the last years of Amenhotep III, and to the reign of at least one of his successors; very few actually name the king, or contain unambiguous indications of date. They paint a picture of profound dissension in Syria—the term may be conveniently used to include Palestine—not indeed such as that which Thutmose III knew how to exploit, when he undertook his grand series of Asiatic campaigns, but one between men loyal to Egypt, and nationalist anti-Egyptian sections. Brothers were divided, chiefs freely impeached one another; they professed the utmost loyalty, but easily changed sides. As the letters themselves are frequently of uncertain sequence and difficult to interpret, it is often impossible for us to sketch the precise course of events. Even for Egypt herself, with a court at which the rival chieftains had their own wire-pullers, the winnowing of the conflicting assurances and inconsistent reports was probably hardly less troublesome than it is for the modern historian.

Egypt, too, was weakened by religious and political differences, at least in the time of Ikhnaton (p. 126 *sq.*); and if her attitude towards the rival chieftains of Syria sometimes seems inexplicable to us, it is to be borne in mind that even in more modern times civilized powers have officially recognized bandit chiefs, and have allowed the desert nomads to levy blackmail upon the peasantry. The scenes of the troubles can be traced along the Phoenician coast, and in Amor, and on lines running down the trade-routes to Jerusalem and Gaza. The chiefs themselves were divided, but the people as a whole readily tended to be anti-Egyptian. Warring

hordes were seizing the townships and land with the connivance of or under the leadership of disloyal chiefs (see above, pp. 107, 123). They include Aramaean nomads (Akhlamū, Sūtū), but are mostly known as *Sa.Gaz* ('robbers'): Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem styles them Khabiru (Habiru, *i.e.* Hebrews?). Although we meet with a number of genuine Semitic names (*e.g.* the Amorite rebel chiefs Abd-Ashirta and Aziru), from the extreme north to the south there is a remarkable prominence of non-Semitic names; they point to the earlier presence and influence of ruling classes from Mitannian, Hittite and other districts. In fact, in the north the Hittites, if not also some at least of the Mitanni, were involved in the anti-Egyptian intrigues, and subsequent events would show that a new attempt was being made from the north to capture Syria. At the same time, the part played by the *Sa.Gaz*, or Habiru, and the indications of unrest among the Sūtū, Akhlamū and other peoples of the Mesopotamian desert, point to large movements in which nomad tribes participated, and not improbably with results significant for the internal constitution of Palestine (see pp. 108, 135, and below, p. 369).

The Amarna and Boghaz Keui tablets enable us to see something of the new prominence of the Hittite power (Hatti)—on the name, see p. 252—and the decline of Mitanni. Hattushil of Kussar (the classical Garsaura) had laid the foundations of the Hatti empire at the expense of the once powerful Halab (Aleppo), Kissuwadna (? Cilicia, p. 272), Ishuwa, and other districts. This his son Shubbiluliuma (? 1410–1370) proceeded to consolidate, thereby threatening Mitanni, whose king Tushratta twice 'magnified himself' against him, a presumption which ultimately led to the downfall of the old buffer-state. The land of Mitanni very closely corresponded to the Naharin and the Hanigalbat of Egyptian and Assyrian sources respectively; it was distinct from Carchemish, Aleppo, Arzawa, Nukhashshi, but closely connected with the Harri, who had their own language (p. 260). The exact connotation of many of the names has not been finally determined; but it is evident that the greater kingdoms were built up at the cost of smaller ones, which were often at bitter enmity with each other. Mitanni, in fact, had grown up at the expense of its two neighbours, Alshe and Assyria (pp. 230, 237), and both of them were preparing to profit from her misfortunes.

The relations among these greater and lesser states varied from time to time, and naturally affected Amor (which in due course came under the influence of Hatti), and no doubt also

Palestine (p. 262 *sq.*). Mitanni had apparently enjoyed stability under its kings, Shaushshatar, Artatama and Shuttarna. With Egypt it felt itself on an equality. Tushratta's aunt had been married to Thutmose IV, perhaps to confirm the peace with Thutmose III, who indeed claims to have overthrown Mitanni. Mutemuya (only her Egyptian name is known, see p. 92) became the mother of Amenhotep III, who took Tushratta's sister Gilukhipa, though not as his chief wife. Tushratta himself came to the throne after a rising; his brother, Artashumara, had been slain by an anti-Egyptian party under Par-khi (or Tu-khi), and for a time Hatti influence prevailed. However, Tushratta slew the murderers, and at once sent messengers to Egypt to resume the friendly relations which Amenhotep III had had with his father Shuttarna. Hatti was quick to recognize the altered situation, and Shubbi-luliuma made a *razzia* against the presumptuous king. In one of his letters Tushratta was able to inform Amenhotep that his god Teshub had given the Hatti into his hand, and he sent, of the booty, chariots and horses for his 'brother' the king, and ornaments and ointments for Gilukhipa. He entreated the king's recognition, and arrangements were made to send his daughter Tadukhipa to the harem, she having first been duly inspected by an Egyptian envoy. After no little haggling over the gold demanded from Egypt—partly as the price for the maiden, partly for some private work upon which he was engaged—the alliance was cemented between Egypt and 'Hanigalbat' (p. 95). According to one of the letters, the goddess Ishtar, 'lady of heaven,' who had been sent to Egypt in the days of his father Shuttarna, now announced her intention, 'to Egypt the land which I love will I go'; but we cannot determine whether it was to bless the nuptial ceremony, or for a later event. The letter in question is marked by an Egyptian registrar as belonging to the thirty-sixth year, and as this would be the year of the death of Amenhotep III, the young widow soon became the wife of Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton).

The death had important consequences. The queen-dowager was Tiy (p. 106), who, if not of Asiatic origin, as some authorities have thought, was the daughter of a man who had been a prince of Zahi (the Lebanon district and Phoenicia). She took a very prominent part in the correspondence between Egypt and Mitanni, and at once begged the Mitannian envoy Gilia to remind Tushratta of the old friendship between her dead husband and Shuttarna. It was now for Tushratta to maintain with the son the alliance he had had with the father; and to strengthen the relations he asked for an interchange of messengers between Tiy

and his wife Yuni. But the results scarcely proved satisfactory. Ikhnaton did not send the expected gifts, or at least only inferior ones; Mitannian envoys were detained in Egypt, and there are references to intrigues. The king of Egypt has to be told to apply to Tiy for confirmation of his father's friendship with Tushratta, and is besought to maintain this friendship, and not listen to anyone else. The position of Mitanni seems to have weakened. Meanwhile, Ashur-uballit, king of Assyria, in a letter to Ikhnaton, manifested some jealousy at that king's more favourable attitude to the 'Hanigalbatian king,' as he calls him. The Babylonian Burraburiash even alludes to Tiy in terms of dissatisfaction; and in a letter of Kadashman-Kharbe (Letter 1, 38) the name Hanigalbat was almost a synonym of contempt. Burraburiash, too, impressed upon Ikhnaton the loyalty of his father Kurigalzu, when Canaanite princelets had sought to gain him on their side against Egypt, and rather pointedly claimed the Assyrians as his vassals (p. 94). And amid all this, the king of Alashiya (cf. Alshe above), writing as an equal—apparently to Ikhnaton—warned him against dealings with Hatti and Shankhar (? Mitanni or neighbourhood). Finally, Shubbiluliuma himself, in a letter to the young ruler, renewed the friendship he had had with his father, meanwhile requesting certain golden images which were due to him from the latter; but of earlier relations with Egypt he says nothing, nor do we know how Ikhnaton replied to the Hittite king who was now troubling his northern frontier. See p. 121 *sq.*

As already mentioned, Tushratta had beaten off the first raid of Shubbiluliuma. On a second raid the Hatti king was met with a threat of reprisals by Tushratta, who claimed the land east of the Euphrates. This he could not tolerate. Ishuwa and other lands he conquered and restored to the realm of Hatti; he entered Alshe, and Tushratta marched out against him, but refrained from fighting. Aleppo (Khalpa) was overpowered, Takuwa of Nia (Niy) submitted, but his brother Akit-Teshub held out with the *Marianni* (nobles?), and with Katna and other cities. Nukhashshi was invaded, and its king, Sharrupshi, having escaped, Takibshari, 'the king's servant,' was set up in his place. Kinza (see p. 262 *sq.*) would have been left alone, but Shutatarra with his son, Aitakkama, challenged him, only to be captured. For a year the Hatti ravaged the land; and ultimately Biashshi-ilish, the son of Shubbiluliuma was placed in charge of the districts recovered: Mt. Niblani, Ashtati, etc. The fate of Mitanni lay in the balance. Tushratta was slain in a household intrigue headed by his son Artatama, whose son Shutatarra (or Shuttarna) became

king of the Harri, burned the royal palace and freely bribed Alshe and Assyria. Akit-Teshub and his *Marianni* were allied with the Harri, and Shubbiluliuma was alarmed at the unexpected development. His son and Mattiuaza (another son of Tushratta) joined forces and marched against Irrite, beyond Carchemish, which Shuttarna had won over. Mitanni was saved, though only to become vassal of the Hatti (see pp. 122, 238, 268). Rather than see Mitanni fall to pieces between Assyria and Alshe, the Hatti king was acute enough to support Mattiuaza; and a detailed treaty was concluded between the great king and his vassal. It was cemented by Mattiuaza's marriage with the king's daughter, who was to rule as queen, no second wife being allowed—though ten women or concubines are specified. It was also stipulated that the alliance should be maintained with Biashshilish. Mitanni thus came under the suzerainty of the Hatti, and the same is also true of Amor, whose king Azira (*i.e.* Aziru), after turning from Shubbiluliuma to the king of Egypt (Ikhnaton), returned, and had the ancestral boundaries of Amor confirmed under a treaty which lasted through the reigns of the next Hatti kings, Murshil and Hattushil (see p. 318 *sq.*).

All these changes, and in particular the new might of Hatti, affected the princes and petty chiefs of Syria, whose letters in the Amarna archives represent, naturally enough, their own, and often a strikingly local view of affairs. These letters can be divided into two series, the one associated with Abd-Ashirta (or Ashirat) and his sons, the foremost of whom was Aziru, and the other with Aziru alone and with Itakama, probably the son of Shutatarra mentioned above. The former series concerns mainly the Amorite attack on Phoenicia, and the latter the movement against the interior, extending as far south as Jerusalem and beyond.

II. PHOENICIA AND AMOR IN THE AMARNA LETTERS

The history of the Phoenician coast-towns is that of the trading-ports from Simyra to Accho (Ptolemais). These were fed by caravans from the interior—later, Aramaean and Arabian, earlier, probably Amorite—and sent out their fleets along the Mediterranean (p. 57 *sq.*). But sea-power was hardly as yet in their hands: the colonies for which the Phoenicians became famous—as distinct from trading-posts and the like—scarcely became prominent in this period. Sea-power often changed hands in ancient times, and now lay with Aegeans and Egyptians (pp. 278, 441). A medley of peoples, Libyan and other, living along

the Mediterranean littoral and in the 'Isles of the Sea,' were thus brought into trading relations with one another, and in this, as in other periods, filled the ranks of mercenaries, sailors, traders and pirates. The population of the exposed coast-towns of the Levant was naturally a mixed one: such towns were often able to influence the history and culture of the inland. Now, the latter part of the second millennium B.C. is marked by some great concerted anti-Egyptian movements by sea and land of outstanding importance for the history of Syria. In one, now under consideration, the Hatti were prominent, and the consequences led to the increase of Hatti power. Another marks the decay of Hatti, and is associated with the appearance of the Philistines, and their hegemony in Palestine before the rise of the Israelite monarchy. Both movements were doubtless part of larger events in the Levant and in west Asia Minor; and in the second of them the historical kernel of the siege of Troy poems may well have been but an incident (cf. p. 547).

The Amarna letters take us at once into the midst of the first of the movements, and we witness the conflict between the Amorite leaders, Abd-Ashirta and his sons, on the one side, and Rib-Addi of Gebal (Byblus), on the other. This ancient city, long known to Egypt, and claiming for herself an importance equal to that of Memphis, was held by a man whose numerous letters (over fifty in number) vividly depict one type, at least, of Semitic character in the fourteenth century B.C. Apparently they date from the last years of Amenhotep III and the opening years of Ikhnaton; and they present an extraordinary picture of successful intrigue by the Amorite chiefs who, while continuously protesting their loyalty to Egypt, are condemned by Rib-Addi and other loyal chiefs (Tyre, Sidon, etc.) for their attacks upon towns which submit to the Egyptian suzerainty. Rib-Addi himself holds Byblus and a portion of the interior, and claims some authority over the coast-line as far as the great and important rival town of Simyra, which is to be found north of Tripolis, rather than at Botrys. But Byblus, once protected by Egypt, and still consistently loyal, is now beset by land and sea. The Amorites steadily extend their sway over the whole *hinterland*, even as in the eighth century B.C., the important inland city of Hamath included in its kingdom Simyra and other coast-towns. In this way they not only cut off the trade of Byblus but, seizing the northern ports, sent wood, copper and other articles direct to Egypt, thereby greatly enriching themselves. Consequently, Byblus became impoverished, and suffered from starvation; people were sold, and houses stripped of their woodwork in order to buy food from the land of Yarimuta,

the while Abd-Ashirta used his corn with increasing success to buy over the towns (cf. p. 123 *sq.*).

Since the day the father of the Egyptian king left Sidon, so Rib-Addi reported to Egypt, the people, starving and disaffected, had gone over, city after city, to the *Sa.Gaz*. Abd-Ashirta, 'the dog,' had seized Simyra and was steadily becoming stronger. But Rib-Addi's appeals fell on deaf ears, and he found the indifference of Egypt inexplicable. Loyal chieftains were wavering, and Rib-Addi hinted at deserting. Repeatedly he prayed for small detachments of Sherden, or of troops from Melukhkha or from Kash (Nubia), to stiffen the faint-hearted garrisons and encourage the hesitating populace. Aduna of Irkata (Arka)—where the road led to the Orontes valley—and the chiefs of other cities were taken by treacherous mercenaries, and the rest were fearing the same fate. On the other hand, Abd-Ashirta, in his own letters, professed himself the king's servant and house-dog; the king himself had set him over Amor, and he guarded the land for the king, though with difficulty, owing to invaders (? the Harri, Letter LX, 14) who threaten to despoil him. In a letter to the Egyptian prefect Pakhanate, defending himself against his opponents, he explained that Shekhlal mercenaries (? from Sagalassus in Pisidia) had seized Simyra (? for Rib-Addi), and killed the nobles of the palace; but that, hurrying from Irkata, he had succeeded in saving four of them. Throughout, the letters from the contending parties are equally plausible.

Meanwhile, Rib-Addi's list of lost cities grows. The case of Botrys (south of Tripolis) is typical. A messenger, sent with a letter of appeal to the king, returns with empty hands; the town at once revolts, though, as Rib-Addi tells Aman-appa, the king's officer, if the king would only send 300 men the city could be recaptured and the situation saved. But, unluckily for him, Rib-Addi has enemies at court, and Abd-Ashirta is kept acquainted with all that happens, and is the more audacious. Rib-Addi then tried an appeal to the king's *amour-propre*. All the royal lands as far as Egypt will join the *Sa.Gaz*—'Wherefore hast thou held back and thy land has been taken? Let it not be said: "In the days of the regents the *Gaz* (*i.e.* the *Sa.Gaz*) took all lands." Let it not likewise be said in the days to come: "And thou canst not take it!" Further, I have sent for the men of the garrison and for horses, and they are not given. Send back word unto me, or, like Yapa-Addi and Zimrida, I will make an alliance with Abd-Ashirta; then should I be saved alive. . . . Further, if thou ~~last~~ not sent back word unto me then will I abandon the city and fall

away together with the men that love me.' Still the king sent no help; and the Amorite called upon his forces to assemble against Byblus at Beth-Ninurta. The position became more critical. In letters to both the king and to the ever-faithful Aman-appa he reported an attempt on his life by one of the Sherden mercenaries; 'he was wounded nine times, but killed the miscreant; a second time he may not escape!' In a special appeal he suggested that the king might buy off the Amorite—he names the sum: a thousand manas of silver and one hundred of gold. His sister and her children he sent to Tyre, but the city deserted to the rebels; and they and the regent, whom he had won over with a gift of copper, were slain. The chief of Sidon, Zimrida, was likewise in league with the Amorite; and to add to all this was the grievance that Zurata of Accho was being more favourably received at court, and had obtained troops for the defence of his own city.

At last the letters to the king and the more outspoken reports to Aman-appa were fruitful. The latter came with a small force and recovered Simyra. Abd-Ashirta fell ill and was killed. The city of Arvad (Aradus) is inculpatated by an unknown correspondent, who points out that the Amorite himself had been recognized by the king. But Abd-Ashirta's place was at once taken by his son Aziru. His first step was to aim at Simyra, and the scenes that follow very closely recall those when Abd-Ashirta was the moving spirit. Once more by intrigue and treason city after city falls, and Rib-Addi soon finds himself cut off from the lands of Zalkhi (? north Syria), and from Ugarit, and is unable to export the wood which Egypt requires. More than ever is the unfortunate regent a marked man. The food-situation again grew worse, Aziru stole the cattle, and the people fled elsewhere to find food. Messengers were sent to the grain-stores of Yarimuta, which were under the powerful Yankhamu; and although food was sent at the royal command, it was held up by Yapa-Addi, an implacable enemy, with whom the chief of Byblus had a couple of serious law-suits touching some stolen ships and goods. Even Yankhamu's loyalty to Egypt was doubtful (xcviii).

A change in the tone of the royal letters suggests that meanwhile there was a new king in Egypt—Ikhnaton. Thus, Rib-Addi pointedly reminds the king that the gods, the Sun-god, and the lady (Baalath), of Gebal have put him on his throne. The king, for his part, manifests a certain querulousness: why does Rib-Addi write so much? why does he complain more than his brethren about the hostility? But Rib-Addi bewails the changed times. 'Once at the sight of an Egyptian the kings of Canaan fled

from before him, but now, the sons of Abd-Ashirta despise the people of Egypt and threaten me with their bloody weapons.' Again, 'when Abd-Ashirta formerly came out against me I was mighty; and behold! now my people are shattered, and I am small.' 'Formerly,' says he, 'when Abd-Ashirta took Simyra, I protected the city alone'; but now the capture of Simyra by Aziru has broken the back of the opposition. It was the old story of intrigue by Egyptian traitors. The sons of Abd-Ashirta had intrigued with the citizens and the Egyptian officer in charge; Ullaza, Ardata and other cities were soon in their hands. The pressure was heavy by land and sea, and troops for the help of Rib-Addi were coolly handed over to Suri (Mitanni); although, as Rib-Addi declared, Mitanni was of old a foe to Egypt (CVIII). Mitanni and Hatti, it should be noticed, are here in league, together with the Amorite chiefs.

The fall of Simyra was followed by anti-Egyptian outbreaks in Byblus; and Rib-Addi, after being repeatedly told to protect himself, now found himself charged with killing some of the royal troops. Pakhura, the Egyptian, whose help he had expected, played the traitor: his troops killed Rib-Addi's Sherden mercenaries, and the city generally was confused and embittered. Abimilki of Tyre strongly supported Rib-Addi, but was hampered by the hostility of his dangerous rival Sidon. Sidon, he informed the king, was collecting ships and men, and Zimrida, the chief of Sidon, had helped in Aziru's seizure of Simyra. The island was cut off from drinking-water (which came from the mainland in boats), from wood, and also from its burial-grounds; for even Uzu (Palaetyrus) was in the hands of the enemy. Some isolated letters from Tyre and Ammunira of Beirut indicate that troops from Egypt were on the way; but the precise date of this intervention cannot be determined, whether after the first or the second capture of Simyra.

At all events, it was to Beirut that Rib-Addi fled in despair. Ten hours after his arrival he sent his son to the court, but four months elapsed before he gained an audience. At last, in two lengthy, moving and well-constructed pieces of composition—probably the last of the long series—he gives a rapid *résumé* of recent events. The fall of Simyra had indeed been the last straw. He himself was old and ill; the gods had turned against him, and he had confessed his sins. Byblus was rent in two. His wife and household urged him to surrender, and his younger brother headed the anti-Egyptian faction. In vain he tried to put down the revolt, until the people cried: 'How long can we withstand

the sons of Abd-Ashirta? Our silver is given to the foe; how long wilt thou continue to kill us?' So he fled, and, once outside, was prevented from re-entering, and was given out for dead. His wives and sons were handed over to Aziru. But even Beirut was being threatened—although Rib-Addi was not without hope of rescue, if only the king had 'another heart.' He himself had still some followers. The temples of Byblus were still rich, and the rebellious city was not so powerful as to be able to withstand the king's forces. And should men say there is no food for the troops—well, it can be had in the other cities! So the old chief made his plea, breathing loyalty to the last—'and (when) I indeed am dead, and my sons, servants of the king, do live, and they write to the king: "give us back our city," why hath my lord withheld himself from me?' Thus was Byblus to find Egypt, as the Israelites did in their day, a bruised reed and a vain help; and it is significant that a couple of centuries later, when Wen-amon paid his famous visit, its king Zakar-baal had the scantiest respect for the authority of the Nile empire (p. 192).

The sequel is disclosed in an important letter from the king of Egypt to Aziru, 'the man of Amor.' The unfortunate Rib-Addi, it seems, at length found himself in Sidon, and fell into the hands of Aziru, who handed him over to his brother-chieftains. His fate is not stated. At least the king condemns Aziru; although he obviously feels that Amor was too powerful and Aziru too crafty; and the letter is an illuminating example of hesitating diplomacy. He had heard that Aziru and 'the man of Kidsha (Kadesh),' *i.e.* Itakama, had had a covenant-meal together. This he deprecates: 'If thou doest service for thy lord the king, what then is there that the king will not do for thee? If thou for any cause longest to do evil, or if thou settest evil, even words of hatred, in thine heart, then wilt thou die, together with all thy family, by the axe of the king. Then do service for thy lord the king and thou art (saved) alive, and know thou that the king desireth not that the whole land of Canaan should be in turmoil¹.'

Aziru, summoned to the king, submissively appealed to Dudu, who was at the court, beseeching him to protect him from the slander of those who, as we know from Rib-Addi's letters, re-

¹ No. CLXII, 32-41. The last words may otherwise mean that the king will allow Aziru freedom if only he will be obedient, as 'the whole land of Canaan is too extensive' for him to reign over it himself (see Knudtzon, p. 1268). Here and elsewhere words have been supplied to fill up broken, illegible or doubtful places, or to make the meaning clear.

garded him and his father as interlopers. 'The lands of Amor are thy lands and my house is thy house, and all that is thy wish do thou write and I will give thee thy wish.' The letters between Aziru and Egypt refer to the rebuilding of Simyra; it was perhaps the condition of his recognition by Egypt. But Aziru, while protesting his loyalty and expressing his willingness to send wood and tribute, condemns the hostility of the nobles of Simyra—much as Abd-Ashirta had done before him—and excuses his delay by the threatening advance of Hatti invaders, who were already in Nukhashshi and Tunip. But it is thoroughly characteristic of these kaleidoscopic scenes that Khatib, an Egyptian envoy, who on one occasion is commended by Aziru, is at another time accused by him of making off with some money and goods sent by the king, and of instigating the kings of Nukhashshi to take his cities. Another messenger, Khani, was sent from Egypt, but Aziru avoided him by going to Tunip. He explained, however, to the king that his brothers and Batti-ilu had loyally received Khani and had given him horses and asses for the journey. His absence was not intentional—'thy gods and Shamash know indeed whether I was not dwelling in Tunip.' And when the question was pointedly put: 'Why didst thou attend to the messenger of the king of Hatti, but my messenger hast thou not tended?' he was clever enough to send, instead of excuses, an effective promise of tribute. An undated tablet from the 'Children (*i.e.* inhabitants) of Tunip' to the king throws some light on the 'other side.' They appeal for help from Aziru, who, after his capture of Simyra, is coming to treat them as he treated Niy; and they lament that for twenty years they had besought the return of the son of Aki-Teshub. The name of the father, it will be seen, reminds us of Akit-Teshub, the brother of the king of Niy, who had been defeated by Shubbiluliuma (p. 301 above).

Khani was again sent to Aziru, and brought a list of the king's enemies to be despatched to Egypt in fetters. Since the names seem to be, partly at least, Egyptian, they may be (as Hall suggests) fugitives from the religious zeal of Ikhnaton. It would certainly be illuminating if an Egyptian party, opposed to Ikhnaton, were involved in these disturbances, especially as in north Syria we shall find evidence for the presence of various Egyptian princes. At all events, Aziru, placed between the two great powers in the north and the south, was playing an ambiguous rôle, and the king of Egypt, while not above making threats, holds out, as we have seen, an offer of peace.

In due course Aziru went to Egypt after having extracted

through Dudu an oath that he would not be harmed. A letter from one of his sons, appealing for his return, states that the kings of Nukhashshi are taunting him: 'Thy father hast thou sold for gold to the king of Egypt, when will he send him out of Egypt?' All the lands and the Sutu bedouins, confident that Aziru would not return, commenced hostilities. A letter from Batti-ilu (Aziru's brother), apparently to Aziru himself, reports progress. The country is in tumult, cities of Amki have been seized by Lupakku, but prompt measures are being taken: 'Our Lord, set not trouble in thy heart, make not thy heart to be troubled.' To the tablet is appended another letter: 'Unto Rab-ili and Abd-urash, unto Ben-ana and Rab-zidki (? associates of Aziru), Amur-ba'alu hath spoken saying "Peace be upon you! Let not your heart be vexed and take not anything to your heart, and here among your houses be peace in abundance," and speak peaceably unto [*i.e.* greet] Anati.'

Letters from the other side warn the king against the new chief of Byblus (? Rib-Addi's disloyal brother). They recapitulate the crimes of Aziru: these prove to be the murder of the kings of Ammia, Irkata and Ardata, which, however, had been previously attributed in other letters to Abd-Ashirta! They assure him that, although Aziru was in Egypt and was being recognized by the king, he was acting disloyally, sending troops to support Itakama and to seize the lands of Amki.

Thus did Aziru play a double game, acting as though he were, to use the words of Rib-Addi, king of Hatti, or Mitanni, or Kash. Subsequently, as we learn from Shubbiluliuma, Aziru renounced whatever pro-Egyptian tendencies he had had, and, returning to his Hittite allegiance, was graciously forgiven and the Hittite-Amorite understanding confirmed (pp. 263 *sq.*, 302, 318 *sq.*).

The Amorite movement had its tentacles along the Phoenician coast, in Syria and in Palestine. Leaving the coast-lands, we have now to trace the events in the Lebanons and Palestine.

III. THE LEBANONS AND PALESTINE IN THE AMARNA LETTERS

Somewhere in north Syria, on the road to Hatti, lived the royal prince Zikar. Another Syrian prince was Biruaza, perhaps the Biriamaza, whom Buraburiash charged with plundering his caravan, in league with Pamakhu, an Egyptian official (pp. 125, 313). The queen Tiy herself was perhaps partly of Syrian origin, and not too highly respected by that king. It is not impossible,

therefore, that we may recognize a group of Egyptian princes in a region already familiar from the story of Sinuhe (vol. 1, p. 229). Complaints of Hatti inroads come from Nukhashshi, where Adad-nirari, a prince with a characteristically Assyrian name, states that the king of Egypt's grandfather, *Manakhbi(r)ia* (Thutmose III), had anointed his grandfather Taku. It may be more than a coincidence that the last name resembles Takuwa of Niy, who was perhaps a grandson (p. 301), and that Takuwa's brother, Akit-Teshub, who with his allies of Katna and other cities withstood the Hatti, recalls in name the father of the exiled prince of Tunip mentioned above (p. 308). From Katna itself the loyal Aki-izzi, whose letters are distinguished by some Hittite or Mitannian words, writes to Nam-mur-ia (Amenhotep III) of the depredations of the Hatti; and we hear of a coalition of kings in Mitanni to oppose the enemy. A hostile alliance, consisting of Aziru, Aitugama (*i.e.* Itakama, of Kadesh), Teuwati, Arzawaia and Dasha, is ravaging Ube (? Damascus), Amki and Mar (*Amor*, iv, 23); Itakama himself is spoken of as a veritable Hatti vassal. But Aki-izzi, and the kings of Niy, Zinzar and Yunanat, place themselves at the disposal of Egypt, and await the arrival of the royal troops.

The details are not clear. Kadesh—presumably that on the Orontes—is the old centre of disaffection (p. 56 *sq.*). The name Nukhashshi recalls the city or district of Nuges of the time of Thutmose III, although, if the latter place is to be confined to the Lebanon, the former would seem to be farther north (see p. 262). It is associated with Aleppo, Kinza, Kissuwadna, and, to judge from its name, was a 'copper' district Hadadezer of Zobah, whom David defeated, controlled rich copper supplies in a district bordering on Hamath¹. The location of Zobah is disputed; there may have been two of the name, one south of Damascus, the other in the neighbourhood of Hamath. But Zobah may well have varied in size from time to time, and since the same is true of Nukhashshi, we need not hesitate to identify the two names. Niy (south of Naharin) and Zinzar (Sezar) are also named by Amenhotep II with Aleppo, Carchemish, Katna and Kadesh (see above, p. 89). From his own records we know that Shubbiluliuma helped Sharrūpshi of Nukhashshi against Mitanni; but later found himself obliged to attack him (p. 301), subsequently making an offensive and defensive alliance with a new king, Teitte, against

¹ 2 Sam. viii, x., 1 Chron. xviii. The name of Hadadezer's rival, the king of Hamath, Tō' or, rather, Tō'ū, is connected, by some authorities, with that of Taku (above). Cf. also Tagi, p. 312.

Egypt, Karduniash (Babylonia), the Harri and others. The treaty in question is of special interest because it includes among the participating gods the gods of the Habiru.

In the fighting that took place brothers were divided. One loyalist complains that he was driven out of his 'father's house,' Tubikhi (cf. Tibhath, rich in copper, 1 Chron. xviii, 8), by a rebellious brother who was seducing the cities, rousing the lands of Amor, and handing the people over to the *Sa.Gaz*. Both sides, as usual, alike declare themselves loyal; and while Aki-izzi tells the Pharaoh how the 'man of Kadesh' had spoiled Namyaza, Itakama's complaint is that his brother Namiawaza (the two names are doubtless identical) had taken away his 'father's house' from Kadesh onwards, and burnt his cities. Namiawaza, in pointing to the loyalty of his ancestors, mentions his father Shuttarna. The name recalls that of the royal house of Tushratta, and suggests that he was of princely blood¹. He guards the caravans to Naharin with his brothers; and with his warriors, chariots, *Sa.Gaz* and Sutu-troops, places himself at the king's disposal. Preparations were made to receive the royal troops, and letters reach Egypt from Artamanya of Zir-Bashan, Abdi-milk of Shashkim, and the chiefs of Kanah (in Asher, Josh. xix, 28), Dubu (cf. Tob, Judg. xi, 3) and Naziba (near Merom?). One writer states that he guards the roads to Busrun; and the chief of Hazor (Abdi-Tirshi) seems almost to expect the king himself. Troops in fact arrived, and the sequel is characteristic of the turmoil. One Aiab reports that the chief of Hazor had robbed him of three of his cities; Abimilki of Tyre too states that the chief of Hazor had gone over to the *Sa.Gaz*. Itakama wrote to complain that his brother handed over to the *Sa.Gaz* the king's cities in Takhshash (cf. the Aramaean Tahash, Gen. xxii, 24) and Ube (Damascus); but he himself, with the help of the king's gods and his Sun-god, recovered them and drove out the foe. On the other side, Namiawaza reports that the royal troops were wantonly given to the *Sa.Gaz* by Biridashwa (? cf. Dasha above, p. 310), who with Arzawaia was destroying Abi (? = Ube); we may conjecture that both of them were brothers of Itakama. Namiawaza himself had been driven out of Yanuamma (Yenoam), and the enemy gained Ashtarti (? Ashtaroth, i.e. Tell 'Ashtarrah), Busrun (22 m. south-east of Edrei) and Khalunni (Nahr el-'Allān near Ashtaroth). Namiawaza, however, boldly proclaimed himself 'servant of the

¹ Especially if the name of the grandfather (...tar, No. cxciv, 10) is really Sha-ush-sha-tar (see p. 300), although there is hardly room for this spelling.

king of Egypt,' and at Kumid (probably in the north of Hermon) maintained the Egyptian cause. The scenes are partly to the north of Palestine, while the three lost cities lay in the region of Decapolis, a well-defined province (cf. 1 Kings iv, 13), subsequently visited by both Ramses II and Seti I. It was a district of considerable political importance, and Seti's monument at Tell esh-Shihāb is about one hour east-south-east of Muzeirib, the meeting-place of roads from Damascus, Nawa, Edrei, Jebel 'Ajlun and Gadara. We are at the confines of Egyptian influence east of the Jordan, and the fact that cities are handed over to the *Sa.Gaz* instead of to the king points to determined efforts, presumably by forces from without, to thrust back the Egyptian frontier.

In central and southern Palestine the leader of the anti-Egyptian party was Labaya, whose letters are strongly coloured by some non-Semitic language, and whom we may identify with the writer of a letter in the Arzawa language. Arzawa itself lay in the north, like Kissuwadna, within the Hittite horizon (p. 272); and we have a polite letter from Nimuria (Amenhotep III) to its king, Tarkhundaraba, sending gifts and requesting his daughter in marriage and also better gifts than he had received before.

The 'sons of Labaya' were in league with the 'sons of Arzaia'; but it is uncertain whether the last name is to be identified with Arzawa, or with the rebel Arzawaia of Rukhizzi (mentioned by Aki-izzi above), or with Arzaya who was among the nobles rescued by Abd-Ashirta from Simyra (p. 304). At all events, these allies, who have very definite northern connections, co-operated with Tagi (see p. 310 n. 1); and his son-in-law Milki-ili; and all are denounced by Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem as leaders of the Habiru (the enemy invariably named by him instead of the *Sa.Gaz*). Labaya, like the rest, vaunted the loyalty of his forefathers, and it is perhaps his son Mut-baal who sends the caravans along to Hanigalbat (Mitanni) and Karduniash (Babylonia), and is the author of an interesting report to the vizier Yankhamu on the situation in south Palestine (p. 316). Labaya himself, for a time at least, seems to have had his centre at Shechem, but he also had connections with Beth-shean and Gezer, so that he must have controlled central Palestine. His ally, Tagi, together with an unnamed brother, also guarded the caravans; he too had some authority in the south, and, in fact, it is at Aijalon, about 14 miles west-north-west of Jerusalem, and a noted trade-route and battle-field, that a caravan of Abdi-Khiba was attacked, and that the sons of Milki-ili (who was at one time opposed to Labaya) were

nearly killed by the *Sa.Gaz*. The events appear to be spread over a number of years; and, as before, there are several indications of the movement of Egyptian troops to restore order¹.

The famous plain of Jezreel was, as ever, the centre of much warlike activity. Labaya, with mercenaries of the *Sa.Gaz* and Kashshi, captured a number of cities, and forced Yashdata, the king of Taanach, to flee to Biridiya of Megiddo. Biridiya, according to a Louvre Tablet (AO 7098), also controlled Shunem (east of Megiddo), and was in touch with Yapu (Joppa, or possibly Yāfa, near Nazareth). But Megiddo itself was likewise in peril. Eventually Egyptian forces arrived and a victory was won, but with unsatisfactory results. Biridiya succeeded in taking Labaya; but Zurata of Accho, who undertook to ship the prisoner to Egypt, released him at Khinatuna (Hannathon), at the same time freeing another important captive and *soi-disant* 'loyalist,' Ba'lumikhir (Baal-mi'ir) of Tienni. It was at Hannathon, east of Accho, and on the northern border of what became the seat of the tribe of Zebulun that the caravans of Burraburiash were plundered with loss of life by Shutatna, son of Sharātum. In this outrage Shutatna had been associated with Shum-Adda, son of Ba-lum-mi, who may be identified with a certain Shumu-khadi detained in Egypt because his name was 'evil before the king' (xcvii). As Sharātum is doubtless our Zurata, both father and son scarcely appear to be loyal to Egypt. We have already seen how Rib-Addi felt that Accho was favoured at his expense; now it is Biridiya of Megiddo who asks 'what have I done to the king that he lightly esteems (*killel*) me, and honours (*kibbed*) my younger brother?' Indeed, we find Zatatna of Accho (*i.e.* Shutatna) asking the king whether Shuta, the Egyptian official, was entitled to command him to hand over to Namiawaza Zirdamiashda, a refugee from Megiddo. Thus, while Abd-Ashirta and his sons were threatening the Phoenician coast, farther south, Accho, if it was not actively supporting the anti-Egyptian movement on the great trade-routes, was playing a part that was hardly acceptable to the pro-Egyptian chiefs, although the Egyptian court itself apparently had no suspicions.

At one time or another—and unfortunately we cannot co-ordinate the events—the anti-Egyptian party had gained both sides of the Jordan and the coast-lands. Labaya had attacked

¹ A letter (ccliv), in which Labaya protests his loyalty, excuses his entry into Gezer, and hands over Dumiia (? his son) who had deserted to the *Sa.Gaz*, is dated by the Egyptian scribe in the year 10 + 2 . . . that is, not of Amenhotep III (1411-1375), but rather of his successor (1375-1358). In that year Ikhnaton's officer Huy records the receipt of tribute from Kharu, *i.e.* Palestine (Breasted, *Ancient Egyptian Records*, II, sec. 1015) See p. 125.

Shunem, Burkun (? Bene-Berak), Gath-Rimmon (near Joppa), Gitpadalla (Gath-?) and Kharabu (? Arrābe, south of Jenin). At Gina (En-Gannim, modern Jenin) he was killed, and his sons at once continued his policy and tried in vain to compel Addu-Ḳarradu, who had recovered Gitpadalla for the king, to join them. Addu-Ḳarradu, in reporting this to the king, insinuates that Namiawaza (whom we have known as the king's loyal servant) is not quite sincere in his endeavours against the enemy. The 'mistress' of Lebaoth (? or Chephirah), the only chieftainess mentioned in the Letters (cclxxiii), states that the *Sa.Gaz* took Ṣabuma (Zeboim) and raided Aijalon and Zorah. Among the appeals that reach the king Dagan-takala cries for deliverance from the *Sa.Gaz*—the 'robbers,' as he calls them—and the Sutū. Addu-dani reports that Beia, the son of Gulate, plundered Gezer, laying a heavy ransom upon the captives, and carried away the men that were being sent to Joppa on the king's service; and from Gezer itself Yapakhi, threatened by *Sa.Gaz* and Sutū, writes that his young brother had joined the *Sa.Gaz*; and the whole land of . . . annaki (?) was hostile.

Maia, one of the royal officers, travelled round with instructions for the chiefs; and letters reach Egypt expressing loyalty and a readiness to prepare for the troops. Steps were taken to put down the revolt, and we hear of a payment of 1400 pieces of silver to a royal prefect, as compensation for some thirteen Egyptians whom the *Sa.Gaz* had wounded (No. cccxiii). Various prisoners were also despatched to Egypt. But Addu-dani has to complain that Maia took out of his hands the city of Manakhate, which he had fortified in readiness for the troops, and he requests that Rianap should be ordered to restore the city. Rianap is the prefect named by Widia of Askalon, and by Pu-Baal of Yurṣa (who had been robbed and could not send his caravan to Egypt). Thus, the scenes are laid along the main routes in the western lowlands (the Shephelah); and Addu-dani, who was perhaps connected with Gath, is one of those who prepare to send a caravan to the king. In his city Manakhate we should probably recognize Manahath, which, in the O.T., is closely associated with Zorah, and, which, according to Israelite tradition, was the camping-station of a band of 600 Danite warriors in the course of their advance from their southern home into north Palestine¹.

¹ Reading Manahath-Dan for Mahaneh-Dan in Judg. xiii, 25, xviii, 12, cf. 1 Chron. ii, 52, 54. Both Bene-Berak and Gath-Rimmon (above) are ascribed later to the Southern Dan. On the Danite movement, see also below, pp. 388, 396.

Gradually the revolt spread southwards and Jerusalem itself was threatened. For a time Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem, Shuwardata of Keilah, Zurata of Accho (above), Enderuta (?) of Achshaph, together with Milki-ili, made common cause; and appeal was made for Yankhamu¹. Then the situation changed and Abdi-Khiba lost his support. He has to warn the king that, through the intrigues of Milki-ili and the sons of Labaya, Gezer, Askalon and Lachish are hostile to Egypt; and another writer reports that Lachish had seized Mukhrashti (its eastern neighbour Mareshah). Milki-ili and Shuwardata hired men of Gezer, Gimti (Gath) and Kilti (Keilah), and seized the land of Rubute (? Rabbah, near Kirjath-jearim). The whole land fell away to the Habiru. Determined efforts were made against Jerusalem itself. 'A city of the land of Jerusalem, whose name is Beth-Ninurta, a city of the king, has gone over to the people of Keilah': so laments Abdi-Khiba, as he depicts the steady aggression of Tagi and other Habiru leaders. And, as if this were not enough, the troops which the king despatched were held back by Addaia in Gaza.

Abdi-Khiba, surrounded by intrigue, even questions the loyalty of the great Yankhamu himself:

What have I done unto my lord the king? Men slander me before my (?) lord the king, (saying) 'Abdi-Khiba hath fallen away from his lord the king.' See, as for me, neither my father nor my mother have set me in this place; the mighty arm of the king hath caused me to enter into the house of my father. Wherefore should (I) sin against my (?) lord the king? While my lord the king liveth, I will say unto the prefect of (my) lord the king: 'Why lovest thou the Habiru and hatest the governors?' And so men malign me before my lord the king! When one says: 'The lands of my lord the king are lost,' so do they malign me before my lord the king! But may my lord the king know this: when my lord the king set a garrison, Enkhamu (*i.e.* Yankhamu) took it (?) all (?).

The other side of the picture is presented by Shuwardata of Keilah, who, with Milki-ili, had been denounced by Abdi-Khiba. In a series of seven letters Shuwardata, without naming the *Sa.Gaz*, appeals for help against a league of thirty hostile cities—citing Yankhamu as witness on his behalf. 'Labaya is dead who took our cities, but, see, another Labaya is Abdi-Khiba, and he takes our cities.' He himself had been sent by the king to make war against Keilah and had recovered it; but the king of Jerusalem had tried to win the men of Keilah back to his side with bribes. He himself had done no harm, 'let the king ask

¹ We owe this important fact mainly to the 'Amarna letter' recently published by Thureau-Dangin (AO 7096; *Rev. Ass.* XIX, 98 sqq.).

whether I have ever taken a man or an ox or an ass from him' (cf. 1 Sam. xii, 3). Amid such charges and counter-charges, the one fact that stands out clearly is the prominence of Jerusalem, an important centre, which was evidently endeavouring to exploit the situation after the death of Labaya.

It would seem that Tagi and his friends were as influential and powerful as Aziru himself. For Tagi, who never fails to protest his loyalty, sent to the king an envoy who had the privilege of a personal interview—for which poor Abdi-Khiba begged in vain—and returned with sundry gifts. Even Milki-ili was in a position to write and ask for healing-myrrh. In such circumstances it is difficult to follow the events with any confidence, and it must suffice to conclude with two representations, the one by the unhappy Abdi-Khiba, and the other by Mut-baal, perhaps a son of Labaya, who, as has been mentioned, had some control over the caravan-route to Mitanni and Babylonia, and was of doubtful allegiance to Egypt. Mut-baal sent what must have been a valuable report to Yankhamu, briefly narrating the situation. It is worth quoting as a specimen (No. cclvi):

Speak unto Yankhamu, my lord, saying: 'Mut-ba'lu thy servant (hath spoken), saying: "At the two feet of my lord have I fallen down. How hath Mut-ba'lu spoken before thee, saying: Ayāb hath fled as the king of Bikhishi hath fled from before the regents of his lord the king? May my lord the king live, may my lord the king live, if Ayāb is in Bikhishi (*i.e.* as my lord the king liveth, Ayāb is *not* in Bikhishi). Behold! two months. . . Of a truth(?) ask Benenima, of a truth (?) ask Yadua, of a truth (?) ask Yashuya whether, since Silim-Marduk (a compound name, analogous to Shelem-iah) hath stolen Ashtarti, he hath fled away, when all the cities of Gari, Udumu (Duma, south of Hebron?), Aduri (Adoraim, west of Hebron), Araru (Aroer, S.E. of Beersheba?), Meshtu, Magdalim (Migdal-Gad, east of Askalon?), Khinyanabi ('well of Anab,' S. Judah?) and Zarki (east of Maon?) are hostile, and when Khawini (south-west of Maon?) and Yabishiba are captured. Further: behold! after thou has written a 'tablet' unto me, have I written unto him. Even before thine arrival from thy journey, then, behold! he will have arrived in Bikhishi and will hear thy words.'"

If the identifications are correct the area concerned apparently lay to the south and south-west of Jerusalem; and Winckler's view that the 'land of Gari' refers to Kharu (the Egyptian name for south Palestine), and is identical with that of the Horites, has much in its favour (see vol. 1, p. 235). This district would naturally concern Abdi-Khiba, who is usually full of complaints against Labaya and other anti-Egyptian leaders. But Shuwardata of Keilah, as we have seen, denounces the king of Jerusalem as 'another Labaya,' and since Mut-baal, who was perhaps Labaya's

son, does not name the Habiru, Sutu or *Sa.Gaz*, it is not improbable that his report refers to the activities of Abdi-Khiba. And as it is addressed to Yankhamu, of whose loyalty Abdi-Khiba is not a little suspicious, it is further probable that this great officer was hand-in-hand with the anti-Egyptian leaders. His attitude to Rib-Addi was certainly not always above reproach (p. 305), and to the fact that his name marks him out as a Semite, and not an Egyptian, it may be added that the high-official Dudu, upon whom the wily Aziru relied, has also a Semitic name, which indeed recalls that of David (cf. p. 323).

In any event, we may recognize Jerusalem as an influential city with extensive interests, exposed to the attacks of hostile neighbours in the west and the north—corresponding to the Philistines and (north) Israelites of a later time—and ready to seize any opportunity to extend its influence. But only on the part of Labaya, Tagi, Milki-ili and their associates do we find any indication of concerted action and unity of purpose over the whole land; and if the letters of Abdi-Khiba are really the latest, they give a melancholy picture of his own waning might. He makes many accusations; and he has many enemies who pursue him ruthlessly. They hinder him from coming to the king, and Kashshi troops had even attempted to kill him. Yet, he declares, he is in the right (*saduk*) as regards these bandits! As far as the lands of Seir, and as far as Gath-Carmel, the lands had revolted and were hostile to him. Tagi had got the land of Gath-Carmel and the men of Gimti (Gath) were in occupation of Beth-shean. 'When there was a ship on the sea the mighty arm of the king held Nah(a)rin and Kapasi (?), but now the Habiru hold the king's cities: the king has no regent left, all are lost¹.' 'The king has set his name upon the land of Jerusalem for ever, therefore can he not forsake the lands of Jerusalem.' But the appeal was in vain; his enemies had gained the king's ear, and the men who controlled or captured the great trade-routes won the day.

Such is the general picture of disturbance by land and sea which the Amarna letters provide. A few crucial pieces of evidence would settle the many obscure questions of date, order and locality. The situation in its broad outlines is characteristic. At other periods and with other actors pro- and anti-Egyptian factions split the land, and determined attempts to utilize such factions were no exception in old Oriental politics. Whether the amiable and peace-loving Ikhnaton is to be held responsible for

¹ Knudtzon's translation ('I once had a ship on the sea when the mighty . . .') is not generally accepted (CCLXXXVIII, 32-40).

the confusion in Syria and Palestine may be questioned; and if he was weak, the queen-mother Tiy was a resolute woman and not without authority. In any case, these letters have the advantage of allowing us to look behind the scenes in a way that is impossible when, as, *e.g.* in the case of the Old Testament, sources have been deliberately selected and shaped, in order to present particular views of the past. They enable us to visualize something of the ebb and flow of life, and to gain through the heterogeneous mass of protests and declarations some knowledge of the psychology of the people, which adds immensely to our understanding of those relatively late narratives upon which our conception of the ancient Hebrews has hitherto been based. But before we turn to notice more closely the life and thought of the Amarna age it will be convenient to supplement the preceding chapters by a rapid survey of the subsequent external history down to the close of our period.

IV. OUTLINE OF HISTORY FROM FOURTEENTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY B.C.

In the south, as we learn from Harmhab's tomb, starving, homeless Asiatics poured into Egypt, beseeching the king to grant them a home, and to send forth his mighty sword (see p. 125 above). The situation appears to have been temporarily relieved, but Harmhab, who was a great administrator, like Hammurabi of Babylon, though on a smaller scale, was fully occupied with his labours on behalf of Egypt. For a time Asia was left to itself, and conditions grew worse. It remained for Seti I to resume the old Egyptian policy, and reconquer Palestine.

In the meantime the Hatti king, Shubbiluliuma seems to have remained in touch with Egypt, and concluded a treaty, perhaps with Harmhab himself (p. 134). Previously, the widow of the short-lived Tutenkhamon, appears to have offered to marry a son of a Hatti king (p. 130); outwardly, friendly relations between Egypt and Hatti evidently prevailed. Shubbiluliuma, after a long reign (? 1411-1359), was followed by Arnuandash and, a few years later, by Murshil (? 1355-1330). In an alliance with Shunashshura of Kissuwadna Murshil restored it to independence, confirming its ancient boundaries (p. 264). Aleppo, too, must be subdued, and a treaty was concluded with its king Rimisharma, by both Murshil and his son Mutallu. Aziru, as we know, submitted to the Hatti (p. 309). His successors, Idn-Teshub, Abbi-Teshub and Bantishinna, seized the throne one after the other, remaining loyal to Hatti; and the last-mentioned married the princess Gashshuliauie, the daughter of another son of Murshil, named

Hattushil, whose son, Nerikka-ilim, was married to Bantishinna's daughter. Hattushil's queen Pudukhipa was a princess of Kis-suwadna. Thus was maintained the Amorite and Hittite connection which became traditional in Palestine (cf. Ezek. xvi and see vol. I, p. 233 *sq.*).

When Seti came to the throne (1314) the situation in Palestine recalls that of the Amarna letters. The Shasu ('plunderers')—already met with in the time of Thutmose III—were up in arms in Palestine; but it is not quite clear whether there was once more a civil war within the land, or whether the weakened state of Palestine had invited a bedouin invasion of which the Amarna letters give the opening scenes (cf. p. 135). In his first year, Seti marched through Canaan, smiting, among other cities, Accho, Beth-Shael (Beth-shean), Yenoam, Tyre and Uzu, Kemed (Kumid), Ullaza and Simyra. He claimed conquests over Hatti, Naharin and Alasa, and stormed a city in the land of Kode (see p. 137). His monuments have been found at Beth-shean and at Ḥomṣ (Emesa); and one at Tell esh-Shihāb in the Decapolis indicates that Egyptian forces were east of the Jordan, as already in the Amarna period. Only a few miles farther north stands the so-called 'Stone of Job,' which commemorates his successor, Ramses II (see pp. 148, 312). Of special interest is the fact that both kings mention, among places in the interior of Phoenicia, Asaru, which is presumably Asher, later the name of one of the tribes of Israel. In spite of the treaty-relations between Hatti and Egypt, the former launched a mighty attack upon Egypt. The effort of the northern power to collect as many confederate states as possible is seen in the lists preserved by the Egyptians (p. 141). Also, in the Egyptian list of the fleeing enemy we encounter a number of typical names of Hatti or Asia Minor affinity. None the less, so little effective was the Egyptian victory that the anti-Egyptian revolt spread to the south. Askalon, among other cities, was stormed, and a relief depicts the defenders with Hittite features. Similarly, Deper (Tabor) in the land of Amor is represented as being in Hittite hands (p. 148).

The famous treaty between Ramses II and Hattushil ignores the minor peoples, except in so far as some reference is made to their gods (*viz.* in the case of Tyre; see p. 266). But no mention is made of the gods of the *Sa.Gaz* or of the Habiru, as in the treaties of Shubbiluliuma with Mitanni and Nukhashshi. Urkhi-Teshub, whom Hattushil had ousted at his accession, attempted to stir up strife, but (in a Boghaz Keui tablet) Ramses informs the king of Mira (Maer) that he faithfully adheres to the

treaty-obligations. Amor, we may suspect, was again playing an ambiguous rôle. How important it then was, is seen in Hattushil's letter to the Kassite Kadashman-Enlil, which not only shows that Hattushil was in alliance with Babylonia during his campaigns against Egypt, but represents his *protégé*, Bantishinna, as exercising influence up to the very borders of Babylonia-itself. In the same letter we read of unrest, both among the Akhlamū nomads (already named in the Amarna letters), and on the part of Assyria. It is about this time, when Urkhi-Teshub is often mentioned in the Boghaz Keui texts, that Shalmaneser I (1276-1257) marched westwards against the Hatti, and their Akhlamū allies, fighting Shattuara, king of Hani (compare the name Shuttarna, p. 241), and visiting Harran, Carchemish and Muşri (? Cappadocia). See also p. 259.

We approach the age of the decline of both Hatti and Egypt, and the increasing unrest among the isles. The mercenaries whom Egypt had trained to war were growing stronger than their masters, and Merneptah (1225-1215) was faced with a powerful combination by land and sea. Egypt, the old storehouse of grain, must needs send food to the impoverished Haṭṭi, who, it would seem, were actually involved in the movements of the Sea-peoples. Some Shasu of Edom were also being allowed to enter and pasture their cattle near Pithom (p. 154). Merneptah's triumphant ode of victory is celebrated both for its literary style and for its allusions to Palestine (p. 169). It contains the earliest mention of Israel (using the sign that denotes a foreign people); but the phrase 'her seed is not' is a conventional expression which does not necessarily refer to a settled agricultural people. Nor need it be a punning reference to Jezreel—as though central Palestine was more specifically Israelite—although *Kharu* (Palestine) is likened to a *Khare* (widow), and Yenoam is made 'as a thing that is naught' (? cp. in the Amarna letters, *ianu mimma*, 'there is nothing'). 'The Canaan' of the inscription appears to be a southern locality. Little can be based upon the order of the names, but the separation of Israel from south *Kharu* and from Gezer and Askalon, closely corresponds to a typical situation (see p. 381).

In the age of confusion before the accession of Ramses III a Syrian gained power in Egypt and, like the Hyksos of old, was notorious for his iconoclastic treatment of the Egyptian gods (p. 171 sq.). Early in the reign of Ramses the Sea-peoples again threatened Egypt, and, as before, the disturbances began west of the Delta. Libyans and Aegeans participated, and with them the Pulesati (Philistines), Thekel (or Zakkal, see p. 173, n. 1) and

others. Hatti, Kode, Carchemish, Arvad and Alashiya fell before them, and the hordes encamped in Amor. Appeals for help reached Egypt, and Ramses proceeded to Zahi (Phoenicia), and claimed to be victorious on sea and land (see pp. 175, 283). None the less, the hold upon Syria slackened, and a fresh campaign was necessary—it was the last effort of Egypt against the Hittites. Against the ‘people of Seir of the tribes of the Shasu’ Ramses must also send a punitive expedition, and a relief at Medinet Habu depicts seven captive chiefs, each with typical costume and physical features: Hittite, Amorite, Thekel, Sherden, Shasu, Tursha and Philistine. Although Ramses III continued to receive tribute from Asia, new political scenes were being set. In Egypt the Theban priests and mercenaries became powerful; but Egyptian inscriptions cease in Sinai after the time of Ramses IV. If anything, it is Syrian influence in Egypt which grows in strength. The Delta gained its independence, and therewith conditions changed in the Levant. The account of the envoy Wenamon, of the days of Ramses XI (1118–1090), is a telling witness, both to the virtual death of Egyptian prestige, and to the independence and importance of the Phoenician coast-towns (pp. 192 *sqq.*). How far the history of Syria and Palestine was affected in these developments will be considered later (see below, pp. 376 *sqq.*).

V. RELATIONS WITH EGYPT

Upon the internal conditions in Syria and Palestine much valuable light is thrown by the Amarna letters, although allowance must naturally be made for the fact that they belong, properly speaking, to a rather restricted period. In them we meet with numerous petty ‘kings’ (*sharrāni*), even of close-lying places (cf. similarly Josh. x–xii). They hold power under the king of Egypt, and this gives them a special claim upon him. They often call themselves the ‘man’ (*amelu*) of the city N.; but the ordinary title is ‘prefect’ (*khazān*), a familiar term in post-biblical Hebrew for an overseer. It is, perhaps, an indication of the prominence of Jerusalem that Abdi-Khiba insists that he is no *khazān* like the rest, but an *ú-e-ú*¹. He is a ‘shepherd’ of the king; it is the title employed by such great kings as Seti I, who calls himself ‘good shepherd,’ and Hammurabi (cf. also Ezek. xxxiv). He very distinctly attributes his position, not to father or mother, but to

¹ It is the title also given to Merire, Ikhnaton’s priest and ‘great seer’ of the god Aton (Breasted, *Ancient Egyptian Records* II, sec. 987).

the king (see the letter, p. 315). Although we meet with hereditary ruling families (Nos. CLXXIX, CLXXXIX, cf. CCCXVII), with their 'father's house' (*bi abi*; cf. the similar term for a tribal division, Ex. vi, 14, etc.), a son who took the place of his slain father must await the arrival of the Egyptian officer (*rabiš*, CCXX). Even a transference from one city to another seems to require a 'renewal' (CXCVII; cf. the Hebrew equivalent in I Sam. xi, 14). Presumably, as was the custom later (e.g. I Macc. vi, 15), the king would send a symbol of investiture (e.g. a ring, CVII). Taku of Nukhashshi was ceremonially anointed by Thutmose III in his own city. When Abimilki of Tyre, in return to a request for information, reports that 'the king of the land of Danuna is dead and his brother has become king after him, and his land is quiet,' the reference is probably to a district outside Egyptian jurisdiction, though the identification is uncertain (see p. 281). We meet with one chieftainess (CCLXXIII); but Yapakhi of Gezer speaks of both his father and mother as faithful servants of the king. Some of the prefects had been taken to Egypt, evidently as hostages: the 'sons of Tunip' anxiously request the return of the son of their old leader, Aki-Teshub; and Yakhtiri, the guardian of Gaza and Joppa, reminds the king that he had been brought to Egypt and had served him, and had stood at the King's Gate (see above, p. 72). Here and elsewhere certain cities were closely associated, e.g. Lachish and Gezer (excavation has shown that they also shared certain cultural elements); or one city would have authority over others, so, for example, Gebal, Tyre and Jerusalem. Cities also differed as regards their rights, some having greater powers and claiming to be as autonomous as any city of Egypt.

Although some larger coalitions can be recognized, the chiefs, while freely impeaching their colleagues (*ibri*, CXXVI; the word is distinct from *Habiru*), are united mainly by their common recognition of the Egyptian divine king. They hold the cities for the king, they take their orders from him, they duly send reports, and 'will do nothing until the king sends reply to his servant' (CCLXXX). Egyptian interests were everywhere represented by the *rabiš*, literally 'the croucher' (watchman?). We may suppose that this servant of the royal 'Shepherd' was his 'dog'; and 'dog' (*kalb*) is a common word for a subservient chieftain, though it is also used as a term of abuse (e.g. applied to Aziru by Rib-Addi). The same official is also called *rabu* ('great one'), *malik* ('counsellor'), or *zukin* (i.e. *sōkēn*, as in Is. xxii, 15). The power of such officials was considerable, their jurisdiction extensive, their loyalty not always above reproach. They might fix the amount of the

tribute (the kings of Nukhashshi, Niy, etc., *LIII*, 50), even as (among the cuneiform tablets discovered at Taanach) Aman-khashir, whose title, however, is not stated, instructed Ishtar-washur to send his tribute to him at Megiddo and, on another occasion, to present himself before him at Gaza. The chiefs frequently refer the king to his officials as testimony for their good conduct or veracity, or for information upon the situation. They ask that one be sent to judge a law-suit, or to enquire into the loyalty of a suspected chief. Such officials were intermediaries, and their goodwill to be desired.

Some of the great chiefs had friends or agents who especially represented their interests at court. Aziru appeals to Dudu, who 'sits before the king' and, incidentally, asks him to name his wants (*p.* 307 *sq.*). Dudu, whose name has a strikingly Semitic appearance (*cf.* Dodo, Dido, David), was perhaps the great Tutu whose tomb is at el-Amarna, a high official who intervened between the king and the foreign envoys. Rib-Addi's friend Aman-appa was a military officer. Similar though not identical letters are sometimes sent to the king and a court official. It was necessary to secure the king's ear, and when Rib-Addi roundly tells the king: 'See, when the king my lord wrote, "sec, troops have gone forth," thou did'st (speak) lies. . .'; we recognize that it was no less necessary to ensure that he was not deceived. From time to time certain officials are directly or indirectly condemned by the chiefs; and Rib-Addi names several Egyptians who were traitors to the Egyptian cause.

The most prominent of all the officials was Yankhamu, virtually the vizier for all Syria, and the royal fan-bearer (*muṣalil sharri*). Rib-Addi tells the king: 'I hear from the mouth of the people that he is a wise man and all the people love him.' His name marks him a Semite, like Dudu (above). He had control of the stores in Yarimuta; and it was his duty to send necessary supplies along the coast: one of Rib-Addi's many complaints was that Simyra was better treated in this respect than Byblus. Houses were stripped of their fine woodwork (*cf.* Zeph. ii, 14), and men sold to him in return for food. He acted as judge in a quarrel between Rib-Addi and Yapa-Addi: a more complicated case, however, was taken to the king. His power is indicated also by the submissive tone of the letters addressed to him; only Yapa-Addi writes abruptly to complain that Yankhamu negligently holds aloof from Simyra which is so closely besieged that ships and corn cannot be taken thither. Yankhamu is pointed to as the man to send or lead troops for the protection of the whole land—north

and south—against the *Sa.Gaz*, but he is sometimes blamed for his negligence, indifference, or double-dealing (p. 315). In this great figure some writers have seen the original of Joseph (note especially Gen. xlvii): he at least illustrates the power which a Syrian could wield in the Egyptian empire (cf. pp. 155, 171, 187). Yankhamu is most closely associated with the land of Yarimuta, which, whether identical or not with that named by Sargon (vol. 1, p. 405), may be placed either in the Delta or more probably in the southern coast-land of Palestine (cf. Jarmuth, p. 353, n. 1). This being so, his alleged anti-Egyptian activities are the more significant.

Yankhamu and other high officials were intermediaries between the king and the vassal chiefs. All business was conducted by messengers, and a son of Aziru complains to the king that Yankhamu prevents his messenger from going to assure him of his readiness to serve him. Rib-Addi, too, among his many laments declares that his messengers could not reach the king, or that the king did not read the tablet, or that a tablet in reply was not sent back. Prevented from sending to court, he must even write for royal permission for Aman-masha, evidently a trusty scribe, to remain with him in order to carry his tablet and, no doubt, his more private instructions (cf. p. 335). On the other hand, chiefs might be summoned to Egypt to explain their conduct. But the chief of Kumid sends his son; and Shubandu, aged and ill in the king's service, sends a substitute. Shuwardata, after expressing his extreme delight at being summoned, enlarges instead upon the necessity of having troops sent to save him, and the wily Aziru passes from the heights of joy to the multiplication of excuses. Abimilki of Tyre points out that a guard must be sent to protect the city before he can leave it. There are also chiefs who, like Rib-Addi, desire to place their case before the king. Hostile chiefs and officials do their best to stop Abdi-Khiba from coming, and he asks for a *rabiš* to conduct him to Egypt. It is a mark of honour for chariots to be sent to convoy the chief to Egypt (CLXXX, CCLXX; cf. Jacob, Gen. xlv, 21, 27). Finally, in the most desperate cases, men fled into Egypt, and the Egyptian records describe the entry of the starving and homeless Semites (p. 125).

There was an elaborate messenger-service. When Rib-Addi employed one of the *Sa.Gaz* to take a tablet into Simyra, he must give him no less than thirteen manas of silver and a set of garments (CXII). Ordinarily the messengers received their rations; and an Egyptian list enumerates the Syrian envoys (*marayna*) who were

fed (at Thebes), and mentions the names of their cities: Megiddo, Chinnereth, Achshaph (?), Taanach, Tienni (cf. above, p. 313), Sharon, Askalon, Hazor, Lachish, etc. The more important envoys—like Khani, when he visited Aziru (p. 308)—are furnished with horses and asses, also cattle, fowls, food and drink. An Egyptian messenger returned with one of Aziru's in order to carry the tribute to Egypt; and parties would be made up, as when the Egyptian prince Zikar sent messengers and presents to Egypt to accompany the envoys returning from Hatti. When Sinuhe left Egypt and fled to Syria, he was passed on from one district to another (vol. 1, p. 226); but something of the nature of a passport appears in the tablet sent by an unnamed though prominent king (? of north Syria) to protect his messenger on his journey (xxx):

Unto the kings of Canaan, the servants of my brother, the king verily hath spoken saying: 'Behold, I have sent Akia, mine envoy, unto my brother, the king of Egypt, *expeditiously to bestow pains upon the affair*¹. Let none detain him, (but) cause him swiftly to enter into Egypt, and take him with haste unto the hand of the prefect of Egypt and let not his hand be against him in aught.'

The messengers would bring the royal tablets to the chiefs, and carry away the acknowledgments. The latter were cast in more or less conventional terms, e.g.: 'Speak unto my lord the king, the sun from heaven, saying: "Zurata, the man of Accho, the servant of the king, the dust of his feet and the ground whereon he treadeth, (hath spoken) saying: At the feet of my lord the king, the sun from heaven, have I bowed down seven times seven times upon the belly and upon the back. Who is the man unto whom his lord the king hath written and he obeyeth not? According to what goeth forth from the mouth of the Sun from heaven, so shall it be done."' Again: 'Unto my lord the king Ba'lu-mikhir, the true servant of the king, (hath spoken) saying: At the feet of my lord, the king, have I fallen down seven times and seven times. Everything whatsoever that the lord king, even the lord, hath done unto his land is very gracious.' Moreover, the chiefs declare that they hearken to the *rabis*, and in particular to a certain official (Maia is especially named) who is travelling round to prepare billets, etc., for the royal troops. Several letters state the readiness of the chiefs to meet chariots or ships and follow the king. Egypt had various garrisons and fortresses scattered over Syria, but the greater campaigns were undertaken only during the summer months. The first campaign

¹ The words in italics are extremely uncertain.

of Thutmose III in Palestine, Lebanon and Nuges, was conducted within six months (see p. 72). It may be added that Rib-Addi in the depths of his despair allowed two months for the journey of his messenger and the arrival of reinforcements; and that Wenamon's messenger took forty-eight days to go from Byblus to the Delta and to return with a cargo (p. 193).

In such circumstances as these, not only was the post of messenger or scribe an important one, but a firsthand acquaintance with Syria was indispensable. In the Papyrus Anastasi I (p. 225), a famous satirical composition of about the time of Ramses II, Amenemope, who claims to be a *maher*, or trained scribe, is mercilessly rallied by Hori, a scribe employed in the royal stables, for his extreme ignorance and incompetence. The style is inimitable, but even a very brief running paraphrastic adaptation will serve the present purpose¹.

O, scribe, to whom nothing is unknown, thou art sent on an expedition to (Phoenicia?) at the head of the victorious army of Sherden, Kehek, Meshwesh, etc., to smite the rebellious *N-r-n* (*ne'ārīn*, youths?). You do not know how to ration them; the bedouins look on secretly; the army wants to start, but there is no bread; why do you punish the men? This is not good; let Mose hear (of it) and he will send to destroy thee². Thou sayest 'I am a scribe, a *maher*.' A swift horse is harnessed, it is like a storm of wind when it goes forth. But thou hast not gone to the land of Hatti or beheld Ube (Damascus). What is the Simyra of Ramses (*viz.* Ramses II) like? Thou hast never been to Kadesh and Tebah, nor to the region of the Shasu, nor the road to (P)-m-g-r, where the trees reach the heavens and lions are more plentiful than leopards, and the Shasu are on every side. Thy chariot is drawn up the hills, or thou hast to carry it, thou sleepest, tired and crushed; thy groom deserts thee and, joining the Shasu, disguises himself as an Asiatic. Thou art robbed of house and goods. What is Byblus like? Tell me about Beirut, Sidon, Zarephath, and Uzu (opposite Tyre). They tell of another city in the sea, Port Tyre its name, water is taken to it in boats, and it is richer in fishes than in sand. Another misery is the crossing of D-r-'m (*Zorah*?). Thou wilt say, it burns more than a (hornet) sting. (This is a play on *Zorah* [*zor'ah*] and *sir'ah*.) Put me on the road to Accho, and Achshaph, the mountain of Shechem (? Mt. Ebal), Hazor, Kh-m-t (Hamath?). . . Which is the way to 'I-d-m-m (Adummim?). Tell me of other towns. Thou hast not gone to Takhshi (cf. p. 311), T-m-n-t (some northern Timnath), Kadesh, Dapur, H-r-n-m (Horonaim?), Kirjath-Anab, Beth-Sepher (*i.e.* Kirjath-Sepher), 'I-d-r-n (Adoraim). . . or Kh-n(r)-ḏ in the land of Ubi, 'a hill upon its boundary, the scene of the battles of every warrior.' Pray, teach me about K-y-n (? Kanah), Rehob, Beth-shean and T-r-k-el, the stream of

¹ *Egyptian Hieratic Texts*, 1, 1, *The Papyrus Anastasi*, by Alan H. Gardiner (Leipzig, 1911).

² Mose, apparently a name for the Pharaoh, was once thought to be Moses (so *e.g.* F. J. Lauth in 1868).

Jordan, how is it crossed? Cause me to know the crossing over to Megiddo. *Thou hast perished like a lion, O good maher.* (In the words italicized the scribe has lapsed into Hebrew.) Thy name becomes like that of the chief of Asher—(his name is given as K-q-r-d-y)—when the hyaena found him in the balsam tree (*bki*, Heb. *bakā*). The Shasu are concealed here: 'some of them are of 4 or 5 cubits, fierce of face; their heart is not mild, and they hearken not to coaxing.' Thou art alone without helper or army (Heb. *šbd*). Thy chariot is overturned, thy horse breaks its harness. At last the sky is revealed, thou fanciest that the enemy is behind thee. Thou hast entered Joppa, and findest the maiden who watches over the gardens. Disgracing thyself, thou art dismissed from the rank of *maher*. Thy shirt of fine linen is taken away. At night, when thou art worn out, men take stealthy weapons, cut the horse's tether, and it flees. The chariot is smashed. 'Give me food and water, for I have arrived safely.' But they turn a deaf ear. Thou makest thy way into the armoury; workshops surround thee, smiths and leather-workers are about thee, and do all that thou wishest. The chariot is repaired, and thou goest forth. What dost thou know of the extremity of the land of Canaan? (The road from Egypt to Raphia is then detailed.) How many leagues' march is it to Gaza? Answer quickly! Render me a report that I may call thee a *maher*, that I may boast to others of thy name of *mariannu*. As for me, I am experienced. . . Behold I have told thee the nature of the *maher*, I have traversed for thee Tenu (*i.e.* Retenu, see vol. 1, p. 229); I have led to thee the foreign countries all at once, and the towns in their order. 'Maybe, some day, thou too wilt be able to describe them and become (a travelled *maher*).'

While this popular composition illustrates both the antiquarianism, and the practical interests of the Egyptian overlords of Syria, another text aims at instilling into the Egyptian the vocabulary necessary for the Foreign Service, and describes the equipment of an expedition to Syria, with a detailed enumeration of the horses, attendants, chariots and weapons. It amounts to a collection of native and foreign terms, indicative of the mingled population of south-west Asia, and proof, if that were necessary, of the advantage of possessing a *lingua franca* over the whole area held by Egypt and the other Oriental powers.

If the great kings could be outspoken with their 'brothers,' and comment upon the poor quality of their gifts, or of their maidens (No. 1, 80), their relations with the vassals were not likely to be less restrained. When Labaya protests his loyalty and readiness to pay tribute, he adds: 'Further, how, if the king hath written for my wife, how should I withhold her? How, if the king hath written unto me: "Plunge a dagger of bronze into thine heart," how should I not do the bidding of the king?' Shatiya (of Enishasi) sends his daughter to the court, and the king asks of the prince of Ammia (?) his daughter and 20 (?) goodly servants, in return for which 'the king, thy lord, will say

"my face give thee life, seeing that thou hast given him, the king, a present with (?) thy daughter." Milki-ili complains to the king that Yankhamu has demanded of him 2000 shekels of silver, and also his wife and children. Perhaps this was not, as in the case of Rib-Addi's subjects, in return for food, but because the vizier thought him a rebel; though Yankhamu's behaviour was not always above suspicion. Men were sent as gifts by the prince of Zikar; Shubandu despatches 500 cattle and 20 maidens, and larger numbers were sent by Abdi-Khiba. In some cases these were probably captured in the civil war. Prisoners and slaves were constantly being sent to Egypt, and are frequently depicted. The children are usually naked to the age of puberty, but the babies are seen carried in a bag on the mother's back. The more elaborately dressed men and women represent captured nobles (*my-r-y-n*, cf. *marianu*, p. 331) and their wives; and, as a consequence of the many wars, Syrians in great numbers entered Egypt and were distributed among the temples (Thebes, Memphis, etc.), or placed in the garrisons and employed as workmen. In this and other ways Egypt became familiar with the Sēmitic words for weapons (chariots, etc.), household vessels, cooking, music, gardening, shipping, etc. (p. 154). Semites appear among the brick-makers at the Temple of Amon (Thutmose III); and the overseer is represented saying to those who bring stone, 'Strengthen your hands, ye people.' After his conquest of Megiddo the same king sent foreign workmen into Egypt; and later, under the Ramessids, mention is made of the Aperu, a foreign folk, who have sometimes been identified with the Hebrews. The name, however, has also been connected with that of Ephraim, or explained (by Müller) as that of a coast-dwelling people, whose name Afri, applied to the Phœnicians of Carthage, was the origin of Africa (see further, p. 357)¹.

From Egyptian descriptions and representations of Syrian products and spoil, and from recent excavation, we can gain vivid pictures of the land, the warlike character of the soldiers, and the extent of intercourse (p. 70 *sq.*). Palestine was generally poorer than Syria. Syria was famed for beautiful and luxurious products, and Thutmose brought of the flowers that are in 'God's Land' (a term sometimes used of Syria), and placed them in the temple of Amon. We read of rich Syrian flocks and herds of asses—elephants were hunted at Niy—of abundant honey, wine and oil; and at Arvad Thutmose III found grain 'more plentiful than the sand of the shore' (cf. the phrase in Gen. xxii, 17, etc.). Moreover,

¹ See W. Max Müller, *M.F.A.G.*, 1913, p. 255.

there were ivory, valuable woods, precious stones, copper, lead and silver, and chariots wrought in gold. Working in gold, to judge from the excavations at Gezer, was understood from early times. The men were sturdy warriors; and mace-heads, flint or bronze arrow-heads, and ballista-stones are among the other relics unearthed. Coats of mail were in use—200 were taken by Thutmose at Megiddo. Representations are found of metal vases closely resembling Aegean workmanship. Phoenicia sends, in particular, vessels decorated with the heads of animals. The pottery unearthed in course of excavation reveals the influence of later Mycenaean ware (cf. pp. 427, 460). The shapes are graceful, with burnished ornamentation, and elaborate painting, which soon degenerates. Geometric patterns abound; but there is little originality, and they are chiefly combinations of a few *motifs*, usually in black, red and buff. Natural objects are often represented: plants, fishes, animals (especially horned goats or ibexes), and particularly birds (see further, pp. 425 *sqq.*). Spindle-whorls, weavers' weights, bone-needles, ivory buttons, etc., testify to a knowledge of weaving. Egyptian paintings often depict the gay dresses of the people (cf. vol. I, p. 228). Among the more noteworthy fashions may be mentioned the pottery figurine from Gezer wearing a sort of tam-o'-shanter, braided round the edge and with six streaming ribbons. Articles for adornment and for cosmetic purposes already abound.

It was a natural weakness for states to regard gifts as tribute, and to treat as either that which really required a *quid pro quo*. So, Thutmose III claims to have received tribute from Assyria; but Ashur-uballit informs Ikhnaton that Egypt had responded to the gifts of his father Ashur-nadin-akhi with 20 talents of gold. The king of Alashiya sends to Egypt consignments of copper, ivory and wood; but he gives a list of the things required (horses, chariots covered with gold, garments, oil, etc.). Egypt demands wood from Byblus, but Rib-Addi reminds the king that the Palace had formerly sent silver to his fathers; meanwhile, Aziru had seized the ports, and had sent ship-loads of wood, and we can guess to what use he put the payments (cf. p. 303). In the story of Wenamon Zakar-baal has his archives with the account of the silver sent in the past; and we also hear how the wood was felled and conveyed to Egypt in six ships (later we hear of floats, I Kings v, 9), in return for Egyptian products (gold, silver, linen, papyrus, hides, coils of rope, lentils and fish). Under different circumstances Seti I compelled the Lebanon nobles to cut down the trees themselves (p. 136)—we see them represented in their best

clothes—and Amenhotep II had made them drag the precious cedar for the sacred barques of Amon over the mountains. We do not know why a petty chief like Milki-ili, at one time a leader of the Habiru, could so confidently ask the king for healing myrrh (CCLXIX). An important vassal-king, Shama-Adda, in return for his present to Egypt, requests a couple of Nubian (*Kashshi*) youths, and also a palace-physician, as he has none on the spot. The art of medicine is an old one; and the famous Ebers medical papyrus refers to the prescription of a man of Byblus¹. It is significant that the Hatti king Hattushil complains to the king of Babylon of the detention of his *āshipu*-priest and of his physician; and to the despatch of the goddess Ishtar by Tush-ratta to the aged Amenhotep III (p. 300), there corresponds a late story where Ramses II sent an image of Khonsu to a Hittite princess of Naharin (p. 151).

VI. LANGUAGE AND WRITING

Intercourse between Egypt and Syria reveals itself in a hundred ways: in the innumerable amulets, scarabs, seals and seal-impressions of Egyptian origin or influence, in the objects of Egyptian alabaster and glass, in the characteristic lotus decoration, and in the direct indications of the presence of Egyptians, as, for example, the statuette of Dudu-Amen of Gezer. Zakar-baal had at hand an Egyptian singer to cheer Wenamon with her songs; and, conversely, Syrian females could be found in Egyptian harems, and officers could rise to high rank. Intermarriages were common, and, in general, the Egyptian province of Syria enjoyed a very considerable internal freedom provided it did not join the enemies of Egypt.

There is archaeological evidence for intercourse with the Aegean, but similar evidence for intercourse with Babylon is relatively inconsiderable (p. 428 *sq.*). Cylinder seals sometimes appear to betray Mesopotamian influence, and some of the cylinders at Gezer represent a peculiar kind of curved scimitar identical with one found in a tomb at Gezer, with another found at Nablus, and with that which has the name of the Assyrian king Adad-nirari, now in the British Museum (p. 239). On the other hand, north

¹ p. 219. The 'Edwin Smith' medical papyrus is proof, however, that in spite of the prominence of magic some little advance had been made in a systematic treatment, which was based upon careful observation and resorted to dissection (Breasted, *Recueil d'Études Égyptologiques... de Champollion*, pp. 385-429). See p. 220.

Mesopotamian influence shows itself unmistakably, as we shall see, in many other ways. Some of the names of the Syrian princes point to the predominance, at an earlier period, of an influence from the north, and suggest the presence of a ruling aristocracy of Aryan or, rather, of early Iranian extraction. Here are to be mentioned the names of Shuwardata ('sun [*surya*]-given') of Keilah, and Yashdata of Taanach. The latter was closely connected with Biridiya of Megiddo, with whose name we may compare Biridashwa (? 'he who owns a great horse') of Yenoam: the second element of this name recurs in the names Dasha, Dasharti, etc., and appears to be Mitannian. Arzawiya's name has also been thought to have an old Iranian origin; and in Artamanya of Zir-Bashan and various similar Mitanni compounds (Artatama, etc.), we may recognize the element *Arta*, which corresponds to the Sanskrit *rita*, 'order' (p. 400), while the second part, *Manya*, is the name of one of Aziru's associates, and reappears in Rusmanya, the chieftain of Sharun (near Lake Gennesaret).

The ending of the name Namiawaza finds several analogies in Asia Minor (cf. Mattiuaza of Mitanni, and see p. 282), and that of Ma (or Ba)yarzana of Khazi (north of Palestine) recalls the Iranian -vārzanu, -barzanes. Among the Indian (Indo-Iranian) gods known to the Hatti of Boghaz Keui were Varuna (the guardian of *rita*), Indra and Mit(h)ra, and the last appears in a contemporary name in Egyptian (see further, p. 401 *sq.*). Winckler's dubious conjecture that the *marianni* mentioned by the Hatti (cf. perhaps the *maher*, p. 326) were a class or caste whose name is that of the Vedic *mārya* 'noble,' should perhaps be mentioned. Undoubtedly much is still uncertain, and the precise affinities of the Hatti language itself, or rather of the chaos of languages in the whole Hittite area, are still under discussion; yet the evidence as a whole points to the presence, amid influences of Asia Minor origin, of some distinctively Iranian (or Aryan) wave; see pp. 13, 253. Although much is at present obscure, remarkable light is being thrown upon early ethnical developments, and upon the extent to which Syria was exposed from time to time to utterly non-Semitic tendencies. The age of Persian influence (sixth-fourth centuries B.C.) thus appears to have had its forerunner in or before the Amarna age.

Later, the Iranian elements seem to have disappeared. But names with Asia Minor analogies can be recognized in the Egyptian list of the Hittite leaders at the battle of Kadesh in the time of Ramses II. Among them is the element *Targ*, the familiar god Tarkh, Tark (p. 271), who, in the Amarna letters, appears

only in the name Tarkhundaraba of Arzawa (p. 272 *sq.*). On the other hand, the divine name Khiba (Khipa), which is familiar in the north (Mitanni and Kissuwadna), is found as far south as Jerusalem in the name Abdi-Khiba, the first part of which ('servant') is read as a Semitic word, although it may well have been a Mitannian equivalent (Putu-). A similar ambiguity attaches to the sign for the god who was known as Teshub, Addu, etc. (vol. 1, p. 231). The form Teshub, common in Mitanni and among the Kassites, is found in Amor (cf. the names, p. 318), and glosses in the Mitannian language appear as far south as Tunip. Indeed, the Mitannian language may also have been known in Amor, where we meet, along with good Semitic names (Aziru, etc.), some which are apparently foreign (*e.g.* Banti-shinna). The names along the coast are partly good Semitic (*e.g.* Abimilki and Zimrida); but a few are strange, like Zatatna (Shutatna) of Accho. It is noteworthy that in an Egyptian list of Keftian names is one that could correspond to Achish (of Gath, in the time of David) and Ikausu (of Ekron, seventh century)—the rest contribute little or nothing, and an alleged Ben-Sisera is 'non-existent' (p. 287). While the Philistines appear in the O.T. practically already Semitized, save that they are not circumcised, the conjecture that Goliath's name stands for some Guli-atta (? cf. the Lydian Alyattes) may just be mentioned. That the coast population contained an intermixture of blood from the Levant is of course only to be expected, and would be in harmony with conditions in subsequent centuries (p. 379). As for the Semitic names, a few in Ben- ('son,' *e.g.* Ben-ana of Byblus, and, later, Banazana of Zir-Bashan) are worth noticing because of the preponderance of this type in the list of Solomon's twelve provincial governors (1 Kings iv).

The native Semitic language was an earlier form of that which is known to us later in Hebrew, Moabite and Phoenician dialects. It has influenced the Babylonian of the cuneiform tablets, and is seen in the many 'glosses' from Byblus, Tyre and Palestine—but not from more northerly places. These glosses are usually severed by a slanting stroke from the preceding word, which they explain or replace; and they represent the current pronunciation, so far as the cuneiform syllabary allowed, whereas the languages mentioned above are written in a consonantal script, and the pronunciation of Hebrew itself is known (apart from Greek forms of names) only from later Rabbinical tradition, after the spoken language had long died out. These glosses, together with ancient place- and personal-names, and the Semitic words pre-

served in Egyptian, present a not inconsiderable amount of interesting material. Thus it appears from an Egyptian source (p. 327) that the word for 'good' agrees with the Phoenician and Arabic (*n'm*) rather than with the Hebrew (*šb*). When Abimilki of Tyre writes: 'if the king says, "be (*kuna*) before the army," the servant says to his lord "I will be" (*ia-a-ia-ia*)'; he appears to employ the two verbs for the copula which become characteristic of Phoenician and of Hebrew respectively. The glosses preserve some older grammatical forms; and while the plural ends in *-m*, as in Phoenician and Hebrew, one Egyptian source has *-n* (*n'ryn*, p. 326), as in the Arabic, Moabite and Aramaic languages.

The Egyptian scribes were familiar with Babylonian, and, it has been suggested (by W. M. Müller), copied their lists of Palestinian, Syrian and other names from cuneiform sources. It is noteworthy that in a list of towns of Cyprus of the thirteenth century, the scribe evidently misunderstood the Assyrian postpositive determinative *ki*, used to indicate the land or district of Salamis, and presents the form Salameski. Later, in the tenth century, the list of Shishak is thought to show some linguistic changes in Palestine, and the character of the Egyptian transliteration has been taken to indicate that a consonantal script had now come into use. However, the problem of the origin and date of the two great branches of the Semitic alphabet—the South Semitic (the old Arabian, etc.) and the North (Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaean, etc.)—still remains uncertain. Zakar-baal, it is true, had his court-journals, and Wenamon took with him 500 rolls of papyrus; but the latter may have been for export from Byblus: the Greek word *biblos* (whence ultimately our 'Bible') being derived from Byblus, like 'parchment' from Pergamum, and 'copper' from Cyprus. Later, at all events, ostraka from Samaria (? ninth century) written with a reed pen, and limestone tablets (Gezer, Tell Sandahannah) were employed; although at Gezer itself cuneiform clay-tablets were in use as late as 650 B.C. The North Semitic alphabet, as known to us, has not been proved to be older than the ninth century, although some writing at Serabit el-Khadim in the Sinaitic peninsula, supposed to date about 1500 B.C., is regarded by good authorities as evidence for the equally remote appearance of this script. See vol. I, p. 189.

At all events, the Babylonian language, with certain dialectical peculiarities, prevailed, not only as the language of diplomatic intercourse in Egypt and south-west Asia, but also, to judge from tablets (some unwritten) found at Taanach (together with a clay-box

for holding them), for more local purposes, and for correspondence between the local chiefs and officials. That some common vehicle would be needed in the place of the different languages and dialects of the heterogeneous population, is natural. Many centuries later it was Aramaic; but that, earlier, the vehicle should have been a language and script so complex and difficult as the Babylonian, must be due to some definite historical cause (see p. 377). The Babylonian language of the Taanach tablets is relatively less precise than that of the Amarna letters, and it is noteworthy that among the tablets discovered at el-Amarna itself were portions of Babylonian myths, written in as simple a form as possible, and furnished with dots to facilitate reading. These were evidently for the purpose of training the Egyptian scribe in the complex script. Moreover, examples of simple exercises were also found, and in one case the order of the signs corresponds to that of the Assyrian syllabaries, and partly agrees with the order of the consonantal signs in the North Semitic alphabet.

It is impossible, of course, to say to what extent the knowledge of Babylonian spread among the people of Palestine¹. Presumably an Egyptian envoy might also act as scribe, although no doubt there were some chieftains who had scribes of their own. It may be pointed out, in passing, that David's scribe, Shavsha (adopting the old form in 1 Chron. xviii, 16), apparently has a Babylonian name ('sun'). The responsibility of the scribe or envoy is obvious when we consider the frequent difficulty of interpreting the letters with their elusive references, the use of some vague 'he,' the ambiguity of negative questions, and so forth. The custom of quoting sometimes becomes complicated; one case runs: 'I frequently said. . . you frequently said. . . so I said. . . and you said. . . and frequently you said. . . so, now, see' (LXXXII). In such circumstances misunderstandings were easy; and of this we may have an example when Rib-Addi is accused of having spoken hostile words against the king, whereas the king seems to have mistaken Rib-Addi's quotation of Abd-Ashirta's hostile utterance for the sentiments of the chief of Byblus himself (LXXIV, 14, 31 *sqq.* and xciv, 14 *sqq.*). The safest plan was both to send a tablet and to instruct the

¹ Letters sometimes reach Egypt from different chiefs, on tablets of apparently the same clay, sometimes couched in almost identical terms (cciii-ccvi), at other times differing only in contents (clxxvii-clxxxiii). A certain close similarity of style is found in different letters though of similar script (ccxcii, ccxcvi, cf. the style of cclxvi), and four appeals from different places in North Palestine agree in almost everything except the sender's name and city (clxxiv *sqq.*, Louvre, AO 7097).

messenger what to say (similarly in 2 Kings xix, 9 *sq.*, 14), and to ensure that both agreed. So, when the Hatti king Murshil made a treaty with Shunashshura of Kissuwadna, he included the following clause:

If the Sun (*i.e.* the king of Hatti) send thee a tablet in which the record of a matter has been put down, and the messenger report (verbally) to thee about the matter which he has brought to thee, if the words of the messenger agree with the wording of the letter, then thou, Shunashshura, believe him. But if the words which thou hast from the mouth of the messenger do not correspond with the words of the letter, thou, Shunashshura, shalt not trust him, and thou shalt surely not take any harm in thy heart over these words.

We hear of Khane, a 'dragoman' (*targumannu*) in connection with Babylonia and with Mitanni: he is perhaps the messenger Khani, whom the king, in a letter to Intaruda of Achshaph calls 'the royal officer (? *Pa.Tur*) in the land of Canaan.' When Wenamon was driven by sea to Alasa and brought before the queen Kheteb, he cries, 'surely there is one among you who understands Egyptian.' Often the letters must be translated to the addressee, and Abdi-Khiba adds to his letters a humble appeal to the royal *tup-shar*—the word is Hebraized in Nahum iii, 17—praying him to 'bring good words' to the king. Two letters could safely be written on one tablet, and Pu-Baal appends to his formal letter to the king another to Shakhshikhashakh to explain his delay in sending a caravan. So also, the letter of Ba'alua and Batti-ilu to their king (probably Aziru) concludes with Amur-ba'al's greeting to Ben-ana and Rab-zidki (CLXX, above p. 309).

An interesting side-light is afforded by the fact that the frontier-officials in the third year of Merneptah were keeping a record both of the messengers passing to and fro, and of the letters they carried into Palestine and Amor, or into Egypt (p. 153). Thus, Baal-Roy, son of Zeper of Gaza, bears letters to Khay, the captain of the infantry, and Baalath-Remeg, chief of Tyre. At the capital the tablets were evidently carefully stored and, if necessary, copied. One of Tushratta's letters to Ikhnaton was copied in 'the second year' (xxvii); and among the archives of Boghaz Keui a letter from Egypt is endorsed: 'written according to the mouth (*i.e.* the wording) of the original tablet, nothing has been changed¹.' Copies were kept of some of the royal letters to other rulers—similarly, at Elephantine, in Upper Egypt, in the fifth century B.C., two copies (with some material variants)

¹ The Boghaz Keui collection furnishes interesting evidence for the copying and recopying of tablets, the specifying of authorship, and for the copying of several tablets on one large one (*e.g.* 30 × 20 cm. in size).

were found of the Aramaic letter sent to Judah—and the preservation at el-Amarna of Yapa-Addi's brusque condemnatory letter to Yankhamu (xcviii) may find its explanation in the sender's instructions: 'Write to the court concerning this affair.' Rib-Addi could implore the king to examine the tablets of his father's house to assure himself of the loyalty of Byblus (Lxxiv), even as, some time later, his disillusioned successor, Zakar-baal, had the journals of his father brought before him in order to acquaint himself with the earlier business dealings between Egypt and Byblus. It is noteworthy, however, that the 'Children of Tunip,' when they refer to their relations with Thutmose, beseech the king to satisfy himself by asking his 'elders' (p. 308). It is an illustration of the different degrees of culture; even as Laban solemnly adjures Jacob not to take other wives besides his (Laban's) daughters (Gen. xxxi), whereas Hatti kings secure the rights of the daughters they give in marriage to their allies or vassals by special articles in the written treaties (cf. p. 302).

It is evident that, when Ikhнатon moved to his new capital at Akhetaton (el-Amarna), some at least of the old records of his predecessors were conveyed. We do not know what proportion of the original total collection the extant 350 odd tablets represent; but we can imagine how the decay of the city (p. 128) and the loss of its archives could affect the course of subsequent diplomacy. As the Judæan locality Kirjath-Sepher (also called Kirjath-Sannah and Debir) ostensibly means 'city of writing or book,' it has been conjectured that there, too, old archives were kept; but although the name was certainly understood in this sense also by the Egyptians ('house of the scribe'), and Debir could be popularly connected with 'speaking, word,' etc., only the spade can settle this exceedingly interesting question.

VII. STYLE AND IDEAS

Among the great rulers themselves conventional stylistic usages were well established. The necessary salutations are duly uttered before the writer turns to his complaints of despoiled caravans, the receipt of insignificant gifts, and so forth. The formal greetings begin with the statement that it is well with the sender, and with his house, wife (wives), children, great ones, horses, chariots, his numerous warriors and his land—of these only a selection is made. The hope is then expressed that it is equally well with the addressee, his house, etc. Greetings are conspicuously brief from Zikar, 'the king's son' (xliv). In writing to his vassals the king

sometimes states at the end of the letter that all is well with him. Thus, to the prince of Ammia, whose daughter he requests, he adds: 'and mayest thou know that the king prospereth as Shamash (*i.e.* the sun) in heaven, (and that) his charioteers are many (and) prosper exceedingly.' In his diplomatic letter to Aziru (see p. 307) he amplifies the preceding with the words: '(from) the Upper Land to the Lower Land, (from) the rising of the sun unto the setting of the sun.' On the other hand, the servility of the vassals to the king is unbounded, and Ammunira of Beirut instructs the messenger who is taking his letter to Egypt as follows (cxli):

Speak unto my lord the king, my Sun, my gods (*ilāni-ia*), the breath of my life, saying: Ammunira, the man of Beirut, thy servant and the dust of thy feet (hath spoken), saying: At the feet of my lord the king, my Sun, my gods, the breath of my life, have I fallen down seven and seven times. Further: I have heard the words of the letter (lit. 'tablet') of my lord the king, my Sun, my gods, the breath of my life, and the heart of thy servant, the dust of the feet of my lord the king, my Sun and my gods, the breath of (my) life, is gladdened very, very much that the breath of my lord the king hath gone forth unto his servant and the dust of his feet. . .

Zimrida of Sidon thus expresses his gratification: 'So was mine heart glad and mine head lifted up, and both mine eyes were brightened at the hearing of the word of my lord the king.' The chiefs call themselves variously the king's charioteer, the charioteer of his two horses, his house-dog—dog is also a term of reproach (see p. 322)—the footstool of his feet (cf. Ps. cx, 1), the dust of his feet (or sandals), the ground on which he treads, the throne on which he sits; they bow seven times and seven times, on belly and on back—and the postures are illustrated in the tomb of Harmhab (1350-15). In the letters of Egyptian officials (to Rib-Addi, Shumu-khadi and Ishtar-washur), the salutation is, 'may the gods (*ilānu*) grant (lit. 'ask,' as in Ps. cxxii, 6) thy peace'; or with the addition of 'and the peace of thy house.' But other letters to Ishtar-washur have more interesting terms: Aman-khashir writes 'Addu (Adad) preserve thy soul,' and Akhi-yawi invokes 'the lord of the gods' (see p. 349), and is distinguished by his wrath when he continues, 'a brother art thou, and love is in thy bowels (*mi-im*, as in Jer. iv, 19) and in thy heart.'

Tushratta, sometimes querulously harping upon his grievances, nevertheless can give an intelligent synopsis of political relations in his letter to Tiy (xxvi). The practice of repeated quotation among the chiefs has already been mentioned. Much space is taken up with protestations of loyalty and with denunciations; but some striking and informing letters are written by Rib-Addi—

especially in his final survey of his last troubles—also by Abimilki of Tyre, and by Abdi-Khiba. These and others (e.g. the report of Mut-baal to Yankhamu (p. 316)) display an ability to give fairly concise and pointed statements, even though we find on comparison that different writers conflict. Generally, the epistolary style prevails: even in the Hittite-Egyptian treaty the first person is used, and each side uses its own terms, and the two versions do not agree. The style of the Egyptian king (e.g. to Aziru) has an individuality of its own; and there is perhaps a touch of irony when an Egyptian official, writing as 'father' to 'son,' tries to learn from the unhappy Rib-Addi whether in a previous letter he was referring to a plague among men or among asses (xcvi). Hebrew humour is grim, as in the stories of Samson, or the foundation of the northern sanctuary of Dan (p. 371); compare also Zakar-baal's allusion to the graves of earlier envoys (p. 193 sq.). Plays upon words were indulged in by Egyptians as by Semitic writers; but the Semite had not the lightness of the Egyptian. The repeated lyrical utterances of Rib-Addi and Abdi-Khiba are early examples of the unrestrained laments of the later Israelites who appeal, not to a divine king of Egypt, their overlord, but to Yahweh; and it is because the Amarna letters are addressed to a king who is regarded as a god, or a representative of a god, that their language and ideas throw valuable light upon the way in which men thought of their sacred beings.

Examples occur of parallelism (Rib-Addi, cxxvii); and two long letters of Mayarzana of Khazi are planned throughout upon an artificial arrangement of strophes, describing separately each misdeed of the *Sa.Gaz* and ending 'and to Aman-khatbi (an Egyptian rebel) came the *Sa.Gaz*.' Namiawaza also writes in a similar elevated style, narrating treacherous deeds, and ending with the refrain, 'and they gave them to the *Sa.Gaz* and gave them not to the king, my lord' (cxcvii). The lament of the men of Tunip contains the striking words: 'Tunip thy city weeps (cf. Lam. i, 2), and its tears run down, and there is none taking hold of our hand' (i.e. helper, cf. Is. xlii, 6). It seems to point to an acquaintance with the similar words in the Babylonian 'Dialogue between Marduk and Ea.' On the other hand, just as Ikhnaton's hymns remind us of Ps. civ (p. 117), so Ps. cxxxix, 7 sq. is suggested in the words of Tagi (cclxiv): 'As for us, consider! My 2 eyes are upon thee. If we go up into heaven (glossed *sha-me-ma*), or if we descend into the earth, yet is our head (glossed *rushunu*) in thine hands. And behold! now have I sought, and I have sent my caravans by the hand of my colleagues unto

my lord the king, and the lord king shall learn that I serve the king and keep watch (over his interests).'

Another interesting image is used both by Tagi and by Yakhtiri: 'I have looked hither and I have looked thither and it is not light; and I have looked unto my lord the king and it is become clear. [And behold! I have set my face to serve my lord the king] and, though a brick may be shaken from beneath its neighbour, yet will I not be shaken from beneath the feet of (*i.e.* from my loyalty to) my lord the king.' The words in square brackets occur only in Tagi's letter. The two tablets are not of the same clay or script, and Yakhtiri, who guards Gaza and Joppa, had spent his youth in Egypt, and is here asserting his unswerving loyalty. Unfortunately there is nothing to show whether, like Tagi, he was also supporting the Habiru and was therefore presumably an associate. At all events, there is verbal identity between them, and they use a simile which reminds us of Isaiah liv, 10. Both Yakhtiri and Baal-mi'ir (? an ally of the Habiru, see p. 313) express their loyalty by saying that they lay their neck to the yoke and bear it, words which recall Jer. xxvii, 11 *sq.* A few other expressions are worthy of notice. Rib-Addi, who employs many striking words and phrases, likes to compare himself to 'a bird in a cage' (used otherwise in Jer. v, 27), and his desolate fields to a husbandless woman. He speaks of a deed that has 'not been done from eternity' (cxxxii *sq.*, cf. Judg. xix, 30). Men are 'slain within a hair' (*i.e.* have hair-breadth escapes). Writing to obey the royal commands, chiefs will say: 'whoso hears not, his house is not, his strength (? life) is not'; or, 'the man who does not serve may the king curse (*arāru*).' Aki-izzi writes: 'to my lord I seek the way, from my lord I depart not,' and Aziru assures the king that Khani (an officer) will tend him 'like a mother (and) like a father.' The men of Irkata pray: 'may the king . . . give a present to his servants while our enemies look on and eat the dust' (c, cf. Isa. xlix, 23). Rib-Addi (cxxxvi) declares that he will die, 'if there is not another heart' to the king¹. It is said that the king 'hates' the offending city—love and hate are the only alternatives (cclxxxvi; cf. Mal. i, 2 *sq.*). The king's 'face' is set against a man, or he 'casts down' a man's face (cclxxxix; cf. the opposite 'accept,' Gen. xix, 21), or he throws him out of his hand (cclxxxiii; cf. i Sam. xxv, 29).

Theoretically, at least, the vassals hold the cities for the king, and the king holds the land for his god. It is quite in accordance with this when Wenamon claims the sea and Lebanon for the

¹ Cf. i Sam. x, 9, also Ezek. xi, 19 (where we should read 'another heart').

god Amon. The cities belong to the king (LV) or, as in Aziru's deferential letter to Dudu, to the royal representative (CLVIII, p. 308). A city will be called the king's 'hand-maid' or 'servant.' When equals correspond each king refers to his own gods: the king of Mitanni has his god Teshub, and he calls upon Shamash and Ishtar to bless his 'brother.' But when alliance with Egypt is concerned, 'Teshub my lord and Amon' are invoked (p. 95); and in the case of his daughter's marriage he names Ishtar and Amon, and 'my gods and the gods of my brother'¹. Similarly, in a treaty each party will have its own gods, together with all conceivable gods and spirits who were likely to be as interested in the proceedings as the chiefs, towns and districts themselves. Gods whose function it was to safeguard oaths and treaties were especially necessary (cf. also the Covenant-god of Shechem, Baal-Berith, p. 387 *sq.*). Aki-izzi of Katna distinguishes between the land of his god and that of Amenhotep's god; and Aziru, before venturing to Egypt, demands a solemn assurance that he shall not be harmed, and informs Dudu 'thou must swear by my gods and by the god A (*i.e.* Amon).' Byblus had long been famous for its great tutelary goddess; and Rib-Addi introduces her in his greetings to Yankhamu: 'the Baalath of Gubla, the goddess of the king, my lord, grant thee strength before the king, thy lord, the Sun of the lands' (CII). Writing to another official he associates with her Amana (*i.e.* Amon, xcv), who is elsewhere called the king's god (LXXI). It was perhaps immediately after the accession of Ikhnaton that he says to the king: 'the gods (*ilānu*), and the Sun-god, and the Baalath of Gubla have granted thee to sit upon the throne of thy father's house in thy land' (CXVI). Other writers are less definite: *e.g.* 'may the gods of the king my lord (protect) his cities, and the two hands of the king... may they protect all his lands' (CCCXXVI). With the help of the king's god or gods chiefs anticipate success (CCXLV); thus Itakama acknowledges the help of the king's gods and his Sun-god (CLXXXIX), and Aziru swears by the same combination: 'thy gods and Shamash know whether I was not living in Tunip' (CLXI). Oaths, it may be added, are also taken by 'the gods who are with thee' (*i.e.* the king, CCIX), or by the repetition of: 'as the king, my lord, lives' (CCXVI, cf. 2 Sam. xv, 21). The deprecatory expression is: 'the king's god forbid that...' (CCL).

The god 'Shamash' is used in the letters to represent the

¹ The erasure of the divine name Amon, which characterized Ikhnaton's iconoclasm (p. 206), is found occasionally in the letters from Mitanni, but they are to Ikhnaton's father, Amenhotep III (xix, 76, xx, 26, 74).

Egyptian sun-god, and with him is identified the king, 'the king of the land, the great or exalted king, the king of battle' (cviii, cxxiii, Rib-Addi). The most striking illustrations of the conception of the divine king are to be found in the letters of Abimilki of Tyre. Thus in cxlvii we read:

My lord is the Sun which goeth forth daily over the lands according to the decree of Shamash, his gracious Father, (and) which liveth by his good breath and returneth (?) after his setting, which putteth the whole land at rest by the might of (his) hand (?), which giveth his thunder like Addu in heaven and all the land quaketh (?) because of his thunder . . . When my lord the king said: 'Be (*kuna*) over the great host,' then said the servant unto his lord: *ia-a-ia-ia* (?) 'I will be'. Upon my back (?) will I bear the command of my lord the king. He that obeyeth his lord the king and serveth him in his place, verily the Sun goeth forth over him, and the good breath (or spirit) cometh back from the mouth of his lord. And, hath he not obeyed the word of his lord, his city perisheth, his house perisheth, nought is his name in all the land for ever. Consider the servant that obeyeth his master; the prosperity of his city, the prosperity of his house, and his name (endure) for evermore. Thou art the Sun which goeth forth over me, and a wall of bronze which has been raised up (?) for him (*i.e.* for me), and because of the mighty hand of my lord the king I am at rest. Lo! I have said unto Shamash, the father of my lord, the king, 'when shall I see the face of my lord, the king?' And lo! I protect Tyre, the great city, for my lord, the king, until the mighty hand (?) of my lord, the king, comes to me in order to give water for me to drink and wood for me to warm myself. . .

The ideas entertained of the divine Egyptian over-lord are of great interest. He is like Addu and Shamash (letters of Rib-Addi, cviii; Abimilki, cxlix; Aziru, clix). He is Aki-izzi's Addu (lii). He is 'my Shamash, my god (*ili*), my gods (*ilāni-ia*)'¹ says Abimilki (cli), 'my lord, my gods, my sun, the sun of heaven' declares Shipti-baal of Lachish (cccxxxi). Among other variations we meet with 'the Sun of the Lands,' 'the son of Shamash whom Shamash (here feminine) loves' (Askalon, cccxxiii), 'the gods of my head' (cxcviii, from Kumid), 'my gods and sun-gods and my breath' (Shuwardata, cclxxxi). Like so much else in the Amarna letters these expressions find parallels in old Semitic and Egyptian literature, and in what is said of the king as the Sun some knowledge of Ikhnaton's hymns may also perhaps be recognized.

Of special interest is the idea of the life-giving power of the royal Sun-god. On the monuments of Ramses III his faithful nobles address him: 'thou art Re. . . when thou risest the people live'; and vanquished chiefs of Amor and Libya cry 'thou art like the sun when he rises, men live at thy appearance, give us the breath which thou givest, that we may bless (using the

¹ For this use of 'gods,' cf. p. 337, and see p. 350.

Hebrew word *b-r-k*) thy double serpent-diadem, that we may speak of thy might to our sons' sons'. . . O thou sun over Egypt, like the one which is in heaven, king Ramses.' And before this, the Hittites vanquished by Ramses II cry, 'give to us the breath that thou givest, O good ruler; lo, we are under thy sandals.' So, in the Amarna letters, while both the king and his representative can grant life and death, the king's breath is life-giving; men anxiously await it, they cannot live without it; it is the manifestation of royal favour. The city of Irkata shuts the city-gate until the king's 'breath' arrives (c); and Yapakhi of Gezer rejoices, 'since it has come to me my heart is exceeding restful.' The conception of a divine breath or spirit was widespread (cf. Ps. civ, 29 *sq.*, also Is. xi, 4, Ezek. xxxvii, 14): Marduk was 'lord of the good breath,' and even many centuries later the king of Israel, Yahweh's anointed, could be called the 'breath' of the people's nostrils (Lam. iv, 20). No less familiar was the belief in the efficacy of the Name. Shumu-khadi's name is 'evil' before the king, and Rib-Addi protests that the name of Abd-Ashirta, the dog, should not be mentioned before the king, the Sun (LXXXV). Abimilki expresses the view that the name of the good endures for ever but that of the bad is destroyed. The king's name spreads fear everywhere (CXLIX). While Rib-Addi appeals to the king's prestige and reputation (cf. Deut. ix, 27 *sq.*, Josh. vii, 9), Abdi-Khiba declares that, because he has set his name upon Jerusalem for ever, the city cannot be neglected (CCLXXXVII; cf. Jer. xiv, 9). More striking is his statement: 'See! the king my lord has set his name at the rising of the sun and at the setting of the sun' (CCLXXXVIII); it is a conception of universal sway which, starting from an imperialist monotheism, subsequently finds a parallel in the religious universalism of Mal. i, 11.

From the foregoing it is obvious that to see the king's eyes (CCLXXXVI) or, more generally, his face, might have a deeper meaning. The 'face' may connote the intention, as when Addu-karradu has no other 'face' than to serve the king (CCL). Rib-Addi, whose face is 'friendly towards the king,' would fain enter and see the king's face (CXLVIII); he has directed his face towards the glory of the king and would see his gracious face (CL). Similarly, Aziru, whose face is upon the king's servants, would see the shining face of the king (CLXV). Biblical ideas of 'face' or 'presence' will be at once recalled. Important envoys might have the honour of eating in the presence of the divine king—at least Burraburiash has to explain an apparent discourtesy as due to his illness (VII); and with the frequent representations of a sacred ceremonial meal

on the Hittite sculptures may be associated certain later religious ideas (e.g. the cup of Yahweh) and the remarkable sacrificial meal on Mt Sinai (Exod. xxiv).

The king was the religious and legal head. Buraburiash holds Ikhnaton responsible for the murder of his traders by the Canaanites: 'kill them and avenge (lit. 'bring back') their blood' (viii). The king of Alashiya is held responsible for the attacks upon Egypt by his men and their piratical Lycian allies; but to remedy his own grievances he in turn applies to the king of Egypt. The prince of Dor would have compensated Wenamon for his losses had the thief been one of his men. All this is in accordance with the custom that the authorities of a district are responsible for offences committed within their realm; so, the city or district governor in Hammurabi's code (xxiii sq., see vol. I, p. 514), the 'elders' in the more primitive conditions of Israel (Deut. xxi), or the sheikh of to-day. The kings expected to be honoured or magnified by one another (xxvi, cf. I Sam. xv, 30). They receive the homage of their vassals who, as depicted on the Egyptian monuments, cry 'salaam!' and 'bless (*b-r-k*)' them (cf. 2 Sam. xiv, 22, R.V.). Intrigue is 'sin,' and Abdi-Khiba, declaring his loyalty and innocence, asserts that he is 'righteous' (*saduḫ*, cclxxxvii, see below, p. 398).

Religious and political ideas were closely interwoven. Oaths were taken in the king's name in Egypt and Babylonia; and when the Amorite Banti-shinna is charged with uttering curses against Babylonia he must clear himself before the gods of his suzerain, Hattushil, and in the presence of an envoy of the offended country. Under oriental religious monarchism the extension of land and that of the national god and of his royal representative were one. Hence we can understand the significance of nature-gods (sun, storm, etc.), who were, as such, not restricted to any one land or people. Ramses II states that he brands the whole land with the god's name, and he assures his dead father, 'I tell of thy valour when I am in a foreign country and make offerings to thee.' This king erected a statue of his majestic self at Tunip, a city which had early relations with Thutmose III, who seems to have built a temple there (cf. p. 88 sq.). The men of Tunip (p. 308) appear to refer to the presence of the king's gods (LIX). At the other end of Palestine, at the southern extremity of Canaan (Pe-Kanan, p. 169), Ramses III built a temple 'like the horizon of heaven which is in the sky,' containing a great statue of the god to which 'the Asiatics came bearing tribute before it, for it was divine.' The custom has an earlier illustration when Senusret I set up his statue at the

boundary of Nubia, that the people might prosper through it and fight for it. East of the Jordan, and on the very border of debatable land, both Seti I and Ramses leave their monuments; and the entrance of the 'Dog River' (Nahr el-Kelb), north of Beirut in Phoenicia, became the most famous of boundary marks (cf. p. 250). Kadesh itself, to the south of Palestine, an ancient boundary city, was also a sacred place, as its name indicates; but that the two cities of the north named Kadesh also marked boundaries can only be conjectured¹. Various cities were assigned to one or other of the Egyptian kings; and Merneptah had a city in the district of 'Aram' (an error for 'Amor'), and also a well which, it has been ingeniously conjectured, appears in the 'fountain of Merneptah' on the borders of Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv, 9; for 'the waters of [*mē*] Nephtoah'). Long before this, however, Thutmose III had dedicated three cities to Amon (Nuges, Yenoam and Herenkeru [?]). The customary method of manifesting loyalty was by burning incense—at Karnak an Asiatic is represented in the act—hence the biblical denunciation of burning incense to other gods than Yahweh (Hos. iv, 13). How salutary obedience to the king and his god was deemed to be is typically expressed in Wenamon's assurance to Zakar-baal that in doing the will of Amon is life and prosperity, 'and thou shalt be pleasant to thy whole land and thy people.'

No doubt when the gods were 'witnesses' to a treaty some symbol would be necessary, corresponding to Joshua's holy stone at the covenant-ceremony at Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 27, cf. Gen. xxxi, 51-54, 2 Kings xi, 14). The gods could journey in the person of their images; and the Mitannian Ishtar of Nineveh declared her will in the words, 'to the land (Egypt) that I love will I go, I will travel around in it.' So also, when Amon-Re, 'king of gods,' says to Wenamon's lord, 'send me,' the 'human envoy' set out bearing 'this great god' in the shape of his envoy 'Amon of the way.' The god himself thus has an envoy (cf. the 'angel' or 'messenger of Yahweh'), and Wenamon must embark from Byblus by night so that no other eye should see the sacred object. In view of these facts it is possible that the images concerning which the kings of Mitanni, etc., write to Egypt are those of the gods or of the sacred kings—that is to say, just as gods witness the treaties, and as, later, kings would recognize the

¹ In the original text of 2 Sam. xxiv, 6, Kadesh seems to have been the boundary between Israel and the (later) Hittites. A *maššēbāh*, or sacred stone, marked the boundary of Aram and Israel in Gilead (Gen. xxxi, 45), and apparently also the boundary of Egypt (Is. xix, 19).

gods of other countries (cf. Solomon, 1 Kings xi, 7 *sq.*), so, earlier, alliances and inter-relations were symbolized or enhanced by the presence of images of the gods or of their divine representatives.

VIII. THE DEITIES

Abundant evidence for the prevalence of Egyptian religious ideas in Palestine is afforded by the innumerable seals and scarabs, and by representations of Osiris, Isis, Ptah, Anubis, Sebek, Bes (with moulds), Hathor, etc., no less than by the presence of Egyptian colonies, their traces in the shape of tombs (Gezer); the remains of actual temples (Byblus, Gezer), incense-burners, etc. At Shihāb Seti I is seen offering a libation to Amon, behind whom stands the goddess Mut (p. 319). To judge from the workmanship the place was the seat of a colony under an Egyptian official. Regard was, however, paid by Egyptian officials to the native gods. An officer of Thutmose III records that he offered sacrifice to a Lebanon goddess, and on the so-called 'Stone of Job' in Hauran Ramses II pays homage to some local god. Aki-izzi of Katna seems to ask Amenhotep III to honour his Sun-god (LV, 56-66); and it is appropriate to observe that, later, when Esarhaddon restored the gods which Sennacherib had captured from Hazael of Aribi, he wrote on them his name, thus endorsing or acknowledging them. The cult of Hathor frequently blended with that of local goddesses, for example, at Byblus and at Serabit (in the Sinaitic Peninsula); and at the latter place the local 'lady of turquoise' was venerated by the Egyptian turquoise-seekers, as naturally as was any local or functional *baal* or *baalath* upon whom the products of nature were supposed to depend (vol. I, p. 209). Not only did Egyptian and Semitic thought share much in common, but a considerable amount of religious syncretism (as was only to be expected) is proved by the archaeology of Syria (*e.g.* the figurines of Astarte, seals, etc.). All the evidence at our disposal points to a well-organized and highly-developed system of belief and practice in Syria; and it is legitimate, on the basis of the comparative and psychological study of religion, to supplement, with due caution, our scanty knowledge of religious conditions in Syria. (For Ikhnaton's reform see below, p. 399 *sq.*)

The phraseology of the Syrian letters to the Egyptian divine king throws considerable light upon the contemporary religious or politico-theological ideas. The institution of the divine kingship was known throughout Egypt and south-west Asia, and the traces of it in the Old Testament indicate that it must have been

familiar to the Hebrews. Throughout there are similar fundamental ideas of the effective relationship between (a) land or people, (b) the national or other god, and (c) the king or other representative of the god. Thus, Egyptian texts of the XIXth Dynasty represent Ramses II as husband of Egypt, the cause of the land's fruitfulness; he is Re, lord of food, plentiful in grain, and producer of rain. Ramses III calls himself the great harvest goddess, the abundant Nile. There was a general underlying similarity of thought, with numerous local and national variations (see vol. I, p. 213). Moreover, certain Babylonian myths were found among the Amarna letters (*viz.* of Adapa, and of Ereshkigal); and traces of Babylonian and other myths subsequently recur in the O.T. Many of the seals unearthed in Palestine point unmistakably to a lively world of ideas. Tablets discovered at Gezer depict, among other objects, sun, moon, star, serpent, fish, crab, scorpion, and apparently an ear of corn and a bucket (Aquarius?). These are possibly emblems of gods, similar to those on the Kassite boundary-stones (vol. I, pp. 566 *sq.*). If 318 (the number of days of the moon's visibility in the lunar year) is, as has been suggested, an old astral *motif*, it occurs not only as the number of Abraham's followers in his battle against Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv, 14), but the daughter of Shuttarna of Mitanni came to Amenhotep with 317 female attendants; and if Abdi-Khiba's caravan captured at Aijalon really numbered 318 (so, possibly, in CCLXXXVII), we may assume that it became a 'stock' figure.

When the temple of Ramses III in Syria is likened to 'the horizon of heaven which is in the sky,' the present scanty archaeological evidence for early temples must be supplemented by the indications in the O.T. of solar and other *motifs* in connection with the temple of Jerusalem itself. Temples required their attendants, and Zakar-baal of Byblus was in the act of sacrificing to his gods when one of his noble youths was seized with a divine frenzy and ordered Wenamon and his god to be sent away. At Taanach Ishtar-washur possessed some image of the goddess Ashirat, and Guli-Addi instructed him to obtain an omen from its finger: the particular form of divination can only be conjectured. In Egypt itself, and later in Syria, the nodding of the god's image was one of the means employed. In some cases rooms with secret chambers appear to have been used for oracular responses: an underground cavern presumably for such a purpose was found at Gezer (cf. also below, p. 576).

The relation between the king and the national god (or gods) finds its analogy in that between the chief and the gods of his

tribe or district. The conception of an appropriate protective deity is well exemplified in the silver tablet accompanying the Hittite-Egyptian Treaty, where the Hittite king and queen are represented embraced by a god and goddess respectively (p. 149 *sq.*). Rib-Addi of Byblus venerated the Baalath, or tutelary goddess of the city, whose devotees are perhaps mentioned (LXXXIII, 54). Apparently he also had his Tammuz, the later Adonis (LXXXIV, 33), and in centuries to come the death of Adonis was annually bewailed at the sanctuary of Astarte in Byblus. As already noticed, Rib-Addi names Shamash (CXIII), and couples with Baalath the Egyptian king's god Amon, giving the first place to the latter. He tells how, in his despair, he had proposed to flee to Egypt with his gods, and with all that belonged to the Baalath (CXXIX, CXXXII), and he records that the gods of Byblus were angry, and that he had confessed (lit. 'opened,' contrast Prov. xxviii, 13) his sins to them (CXXXVII). The gods even desert the city (CXXXIV, 10)—just as in later days Yahweh left Jerusalem at its fall, and returned to it at the restoration after the Exile.

The Baalath of Gebal, long known in Egypt, was not the only Asiatic or Syrian deity whose prominence is attested by Egyptian references (see p. 159, cf. p. 154 *sq.*). The war-god Resheph is represented in Egypt armed with shield, spear, battle-axe and quiver; he is a 'lord of heaven,' and is bearded. He wears a conical helmet (or otherwise a fillet), which is ornamented with the head of some goat-like animal with horns projecting forward. Valiant officers of Ramses III are likened to Resheph-gods. (In later times Resheph was identified with Apollo.) The name of his consort (*A-t-m*) seems to be combined with the Sun-god Shamash in a north-Palestinian town (Shemesh-Edom, or the like) mentioned by Thutmose III and Amenhotep II (p. 89). Both Resheph and his consort are mentioned along with 'the high god' and his wife Neker (*i.e.* Nin-kal, 'the great lady'), and with Anath. Anath, already met with under the Hyksos (vol. 1, p. 233), had her priesthood at Thebes in the time of Thutmose III; she is represented enthroned with spear and shield in the right hand, and in the left a battle-axe. Or she stands clad in a panther skin, holding the papyrus-sceptre and emblem of life; her crown of feathers sometimes has a pair of horns at the base. Anath, who is often coupled with Astarte, was evidently regarded by the conquering Pharaohs as the great war-goddess of Syria. The goddess Kadesh ('holy') was assimilated in Egypt to Hathor. She stands nude upon a lion, holding in her left hand a hydra and in the right the spica; her heavy tresses are sometimes surmounted by the sun-

disk between two horns. She is called lady of heaven, mistress of the gods; and formed a triad with Resheph, and with Min (Tammuz-Adonis), the old harvest-deity and god of reproduction.

Astarte (O.T. Ashtoreth) herself had a place in several Egyptian temples, and at Memphis, in Merneptah's day, was associated with the female counterpart of the god who gave his name to Baal-zephon near the 'Red Sea' (Ex. xiv, 2), and is also later met with in Phoenicia. Not only goddess of love, Astarte was also goddess of war. Depicted with the head of a lioness she drives her chariot over the foe; she is 'mistress of horses and lady of chariots.' In the Amarna letters Astarte coalesces with Ashirat, as is seen in the varying forms of the name of the Amorite Abdi-Ashirta (Ashrati, Ashtarti). In Ashirat we have the typical goddess of the west, known long before as the wife of the king of heaven; while in Arabia she was the wife of the moon-god. Her spouse, the god Amor, who has the same name as the land and people (vol. I, p. 231), is mentioned in a Babylonian list of gods as the god of the Sutū. The masculine form Ashir may possibly be identified with that of the great god Ashur himself (*loc. cit.*). In Israel Asherah (as the Ashērah or tree-trunk) and Astarte (the biblical Ashtoreth) became closely associated with the cult of Yahweh, but for the presence of this god there is as yet no clear evidence.

The gods of the *Sa.Gaz* and of the Habiru are invoked in the Hittite treaties with Mattiuaza of Mitanni and with Teitte of Nukhashshi, respectively, but none are named. A god Habiru is also known; cf. the god and tribe Gad, and Amor (above). The ordinary term El, 'god,' was of course familiar, and the age of Ramses III furnishes the name El-ram, 'El is high' (cf. the O.T. Jeho-ram), and a Palestinian place-name which has been conjecturally interpreted as Levi-El, though this is more doubtful. Very familiar is the term Baal, whose fundamental meaning is, perhaps, not owner, but rather producer, functionary, *genius* (see vol. I, p. 207 *sq.*). In the Amarna letters Baal appears in some compound names (B.-ya, B.-mi'ir, Amur-B., Mut-B., Pu-B., Shipti-B.). It interchanges with Addu (*i.e.* Adad, or the later Hadad), the famous god of storm, thunder, rain and war (vol. I, p. 231 *sq.*). But strangely enough Addu is not among the foreign gods accepted by Egypt, although he belongs to a widespread type of god with various specific names (Hadad, Ramman, Teshub, etc., cf. also p. 613). It is possible, therefore, that the god Sutekh (Set), who took firm root in Egypt from the time of the Hyksos, strictly corresponds to Addu. The name of Baal, although found in the Hyksos period (vol. I, p. 233), does not become

prominent in Egypt until the XIXth and XXth Dynasties, when Ramses II and III are specially likened to 'the Baal' (with the definite article). Baal is then the thundering, roaring god of war, before whom prisoners are slain that the king may live for ever. The king is like Sutekh, and Baal is in his limbs; or, he is Set, and Baal is in his body. He is as Baal in his hour (*i.e.* of manifestation). He is 'his real son for ever,' his wrath is 'like Baal in heaven'; and Amon-Re declares to Ramses III: 'I overthrow for thee every land, when they see thy majesty in strength, like my son, Baal in his wrath.' Baal, it is obvious, was one of the most prominent of gods, if not in the Amarna period, at least in the following age. On the other hand, the name of the god Hadad, although not unknown in Palestine—it is combined with the similar god Rimmon in connection with Megiddo, the most notorious of all battle-fields (Zech. xii, 11)—becomes more prominent outside Palestine, in Edom and Syria. Moreover, it is highly significant that the collector of tribute under the Israelite kings David and Solomon is called Adoni-ram, 'the lord is high,' or 'Adoram (Hadoram), the latter representing Addu-ram, 'Addu is high.' Further, Hadoram is also the alternative name of David's adversary Joram ('Yahu is high'), the son of To'i of Hamath (cf. Tagi, above, p. 310, n.). Thus, there is an interchange of divine names, just as later, in the time of Sargon, a king of Hamath is called varyingly Yau-bi'di or Ilu-bi'di, the specific Yahu (Yahweh) interchanging with the neutral Ilu ('god') as it does, for example, in the biblical names Jeho-iakim and El-iakim. This interrelation between Addu and Yahweh is entirely in harmony with the fact that Addu (Hadad), Baal and Yahweh had much in common.

Although the names Addu, Baal and Yahweh thus stand out above the rest, the last-mentioned has not yet been clearly traced in Syria and Palestine. Some scholars identify with it Ya (and the feminine Ya-tum, Ya-u-ti) found in early Babylonian and Kassite names; but the Palestinian place-name Batiya (mentioned by Thutmose III) is hardly Beth-Yah, 'house of Yahweh.' On the other hand, the name of Akhi-yawi, in one of the Taanach letters, may more safely be cited as an older form of the biblical Ahijah (Akhi-yah), 'Yahweh is brother.' It is certainly noteworthy that in his letter to Ishtar-washur—the divine name Ishtar could equally well be read Astarte, Ashirat, etc.—he invokes 'the lord of the gods' (cf. p. 337). Moreover, he has some obscure reference to 'one who is over my head,' who of course may be not a god, but some official. If this name is proof that the god

Yahweh was already known in Palestine, he has not the prominence of the other gods; nor can it be determined whether, as has also been argued, he was a moon-god. The existence of moon-cults has, moreover, been inferred from—among other details—the names Jericho and Sin (Sinai), the latter being the name of the famous god especially connected with Ur and Harran, with both of which the Hebrews are traditionally associated (vol. I, p. 234).

The existence of other gods—Dagon, Ninurta, Melek, to mention only three—is suggested by the proper names in the Amarna letters. But the difference between the Amarna and later periods shows itself most markedly in the disappearance of Addu, and the later prominence of Yahweh, together with the persistence of Baal. The name of Yahweh, in fact, appears to have replaced that of Addu.

An international age fostered a religious internationalism (cf. p. 485). Moreover tendencies to monotheism, or rather monolatry, appear in the Amarna age, in Palestine and Syria, as elsewhere (pp. 110 *sq.*, 203 *sq.*, 205 *sq.*). They are due to the desire to simplify and co-ordinate the many local, national and functional gods, and to the endeavour to recognize some supreme god or king of gods, corresponding to the great king who rules over a number of lesser kings or chiefs. Moreover, the plural *ilānu* ('gods') is used in the same amplifying and summarizing sense as the Hebrew *Elōhim*; and it is employed (*a*) absolutely without further specification (e.g. xcvi, 4 *sq.*, 'may God ask [in the singular] thy peace'), or (*b*) in combination with some particular god (see p. 400), and (*c*) by Abimilki of Tyre, and others, as a title of the Egyptian king (see p. 341). The rise of Yahwism as the *national* religion thus constitutes the outstanding feature of Palestinian history—*after the Amarna age*.

While the sun-gods from Egypt to Asia Minor and Babylonia could be identified with one another, there are some traces of a sun-goddess in early Arabia and in a letter from Askalon (above, p. 341). Also among the Hatti the sun-goddess of Arinna 'sends kingship and queenship,' and is evidently the patroness of the dynasty—before her was placed a copy of the treaty between Shub-iluliuma and Mattiuaza (p. 271). Whether some sweeping social, historical or ethnical changes are involved in this variation of sex can hardly be determined; but that some profound differences made themselves felt is evident on other grounds. Thus, it is noteworthy that, as distinct from astral features, characteristic animal features insist on manifesting themselves in the repre-

sentation and symbolism of the gods. Different religious levels are recognizable as we pass from the priestly and ruling circles to the simpler classes with their rude amulets and charms, their innumerable realistic and often syncretistic models of some mother-goddess, or the ever-popular Bes. The Egyptian king, who is likened to Baal, is also like a bull; and the bull-symbol is inveterate, whether it is Hadad that stands upon the bull, or whether the bull is subsequently associated in one form or another with the Phoenician Baal or the Israelite Yahweh. As a symbol of strength, virility and fierceness the bull enters naturally into conceptions of divine and kingly might, for it is imperative that both the god and the king should be in possession of all the attributes necessary for the welfare of their loyal subjects and worshippers. It is for this reason that, in order to simplify and co-ordinate, gods are compounded (Amon-Re), or their characteristics are transferred from one to the other. Especially noteworthy is the combination of Shamash and Addu. The Egyptian king is compared by his Syrian vassals to both Shamash and Addu; Wenamon tells how the Sun-god Amon 'thunders' in the heavens; the Assyrian king Ashur-naṣir-pal (ninth century) prominently couples in his invocation Shamash and Addu; and, finally, in the ancient Assyrian royal name Shamshi-Adad, the attributes of the two are merged into one being. Fusion of this nature is inevitable if a god is to become supreme over others; and it is on this account that, in the centuries that follow, reforming movements arose to purify the composite ideas that prevailed touching the character and nature of the supreme Israelite god Yahweh.

In the religion of Syria and Palestine, then, we should expect to find the foregoing tendencies and their consequences; and, indeed, when we come to the later period, the gulf between the general religious ideas and those of this earlier period is not wide. Some general parallels have already been noticed. Certain changes do indeed make themselves felt, and the ages following that of the Amarna letters witnessed some profound historical developments. But we shall then find ourselves looking at the history through other eyes. It is necessary, therefore, to observe that under Ramses III Palestine and Syria were still tributary, and that even Zakar-baal, with all his independence, is not entirely oblivious to the claims of Egypt's god (cf. p. 193). Certain ways of life and thought had become infixed from of old in a land which was in many essential respects one with the surrounding powers.

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT NARRATIVE


BY the close of the second millenium B.C. a number of minor independent states had made their appearance in Syria and Palestine. Some important Phoenician and Aramaean settlements are found in the north; then, Israel, Judah and various Philistine cities on the west of the Jordan, and, on its east, Gilead, Ammon and Moab; still farther south lies Edom with its connections reaching towards Egypt and north Arabia. Of these Israel and Judah especially attract attention on account of the part they are about to play in the religious history of south-west Asia. A united Hebrew monarchy arose, and became the type of greatness. But how it arose and what it meant have yet to be determined, for, although the O.T., practically our sole source, seems in a sense to contain the history of the Hebrews or Israelites, modern critical opinion can be summed up in the statement that: 'the O.T. does not furnish a history of Israel, though it supplies the materials from which such a history can be constructed¹.'

According to the traditions which came to prevail, Jacob (otherwise known as Israel) and his elder twin-brother Esau (or Edom) were grandsons of Abram (or Abraham) of Hebron in south Palestine. Their 'father' Isaac was associated with Beer-sheba, to the south of Hebron, and Abram's nephew, Lot, was 'father' of Moab and Ammon. Abram was thus the ancestor of the Hebrews, a wider term than 'Israel' (vol. I, pp. 185, 233). In response to the summons of Yahweh he entered Canaan, and journeyed from Shechem to Bethel, and thence to the south. Later, Jacob left his father and brother, settled among Aramaeans (apparently south of Damascus), and after some years re-entered with the sons of his Aramaean wives, settling first at Shechem and then in the south. Driven into Egypt by a famine the family was protected by a friendly Pharaoh; but under a later hostile monarch the 'Children of Israel'—for the family has now become a number

¹ W. Robertson Smith, Preface to Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885), p. vii. See the qualification, p. 356, n. 1, below.

The alphabetical arrangement ignores the prefixes *al-*, *ar-* etc. ('the'), *J.* (*jebel*, 'mountain'), *h.* (*hikmah*, 'wisdom'), *T.* (*tell*, 'mound'), *u.* (*Umm*, 'mother'), *W.* (*Wadi*, 'valley').

- [illegible]



of interrelated tribes—suffered grievous oppression. Moses, a fugitive from justice, feeding the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro (in one version the priest of Midian), was raised up by Yahweh to deliver his people, and with his brother Aaron headed the exodus from the 'house of slaves.' After a series of signs and wonders culminating in the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, Israel escaped and marched to Sinai, or Horeb, the scene of a solemn covenant between Yahweh and the people, and the occasion for the promulgation of various religious, legal and other institutions for the future. It is here that we have the inauguration of Mosaism or Judaism, the foundation of all subsequent Jewish belief and practice.

Men were sent to spy out Palestine; but the Israelites, terrified at their report, were doomed to spend forty years in the wilderness until all the adults had died off (Num. xiv, 33; Deut. ii, 16). A new generation had the privilege of conquering the land promised to their fathers. After making a circuitous journey round by the head of the Gulf of Akabah and the east of the Dead Sea, Israel seized the territory east of the Jordan as far as Gilead and Hermon (Deut. iii, 8 *sqq.*). A second covenant was made by Moses, shortly before his death (Deut. xxix, 1, compared with v, 2). Led by Joshua, Israel at length crossed the Jordan, and at Gilgal the new generation submitted to the national rite of circumcision (Josh. v; cf. Gen. xvii). In due course they captured Jericho, Ai and presumably Bethel, and the men of Gibeon in alarm obtained an alliance by subterfuge. Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon united, but were defeated; and Joshua took Libnah, Gezer and Debir (or Kirjath-Sepher), smiting southern Palestine, 'from Kadesh-Barnea unto Gaza and all the land of Goshen, even unto Gibeon¹.' In the north Joshua defeated another alliance involving cities from the *hinterland* of Dor to the south of Lake Chinnereth (Gennesaret), and won the land as far as Lebanon and Mt Hermon. Arrangements were made to divide the land west of the Jordan among the tribes, although much still remained to be taken (Josh. xiii). Soon after a solemn assembly of the people and a third covenant (at Shechem) Joshua died, and there arose

¹ Josh. x, 41. The name Jarmuth resembles the Yarimuta of the Amarna letters (p. 324). It should be noticed that the *j* in biblical names should properly be *y* (yērikhoh, yēhōshūa, etc.); the English *j* is not found in Hebrew. Jehovah, however, should not be Yehovah or Yehōwah, because the vowels of *Adōnāy* ('lord') have been applied to the consonants of the Ineffable Name (in the English Bible 'Lord'), the original pronunciation of which may have been Yahweh. See vol. 1, p. 185, note.

another generation that knew not Yahweh, nor what he had wrought for Israel (Judg. ii, 10).

Thus Yahweh became the God of Israel, and Israel the people of Yahweh in his land. But the tables were now quickly turned. The Israelites newly settled began to suffer from surrounding tribes and raiders, and from still unconquered Canaanites and other peoples of Palestine. There were alternating periods, first of apostasy and suffering, and then of deliverance, when a 'judge' arose, or was raised up to save Yahweh's people. The early unity of Israel seems destroyed, but an ancient poem of the victory over Sisera and the Canaanites shows that the tribes could combine; though some were apathetic, and Judah is conspicuously absent (Judg. v). We reach the age of the Philistine oppression: the boisterous Samson of the tribe of Dan and the prophet Samuel of Ephraim are—apart from the unknown Shamgar, the son of Anath—the first great saviours, and also 'judges' of widely different types. Saul founded the monarchy, and of this there are two distinct versions: (a) he was divinely chosen to deliver Israel from the Philistine occupation (1 Sam. ix, xiii); and (b) the people, saved by Samuel from the Philistines, demanded a king, a demand which was offensive, because Yahweh was king (viii, x, 17 *sqq.*, xii). The two versions conflict absolutely. Throughout, the history is written from a religious standpoint; and Saul, barely appointed king, is condemned by Yahweh, and the young David of Bethlehem selected in his stead. To Saul notable conquests are however ascribed (1 Sam. xiv, 47–51), and an old poem, cited from the book of Jashar, sings his praise (2 Sam. i). After a brief reign he was overwhelmed by the Philistines at Mt Gilboa, and it remained for David to reconquer them and free Israel. Anointed king of Judah at Hebron, David moved north, fighting Philistines and capturing Jerusalem from the hand of the Jebusites (c. 1000 B.C.). He made it his capital, subdued all the neighbouring peoples, and proposed to build the temple. The temple of Jerusalem is the great climax towards which the religious history of the people had been moving. The work was taken in hand and completed by his son Solomon, to whom are ascribed a powerful and extensive kingdom, enormous wealth, and profound wisdom and piety. But cracks in the edifice were already visible, and at his death north and south fell apart, and the separate kingdoms of Israel and Judah entered upon their lengthy history (c. 932 B.C.). They remained implacable rivals, for the north forsook Jerusalem and its temple; and later, when the northern tribes were exiled (eighth century B.C.), and a mixed

Samaritan community took their place, Judah felt herself to be the sole heir of the old Israel.

Thus, the united monarchy was of relatively brief duration, although at one time or another the north or the south was able to exercise very considerable influence over its neighbour. But it is to be observed that the name 'Israel' is used to denote (1) all the tribes (the 'sons' of Jacob) before the separation, (2) the northern tribes, either as distinct from an independent Judah, or with the inclusion of a subordinate Judah, and (3) the later Judah who would not recognize the legitimacy of the mixed community to the north. This complicates the study of the sources, and it has been necessary to refer to the later periods because there is good reason to believe that the accounts of the earlier period are not contemporary, but represent later traditions and standpoints, when the rivalry of Judah and Israel was familiar. Indeed it is not until we come to the later history that we can recognize some of the political and religious vicissitudes which have at least helped to shape the accounts in question.

The space given to the early history in the O.T. is, in itself, an indication of the significance it had for later ages, and of the anxiety to find in the distant past the foundations of the present. The conception of history as there displayed becomes the only orthodox one; see the brief summary in Deut. xxvi, 5-10. Under the influence of a religious enthusiasm there had been a mighty invasion—the conquests of Islam may be compared. Tribes were knit together to conquer the land promised to their ancestors, and it is entirely natural that, as the enthusiasm died down, and as they passed from nomad or semi-nomad to settled conditions, there should have been some disintegration, some relaxation of religious discipline (most notably illustrated in the book of Judges), and the need for that stimulus of the prophetic figures so characteristic of the biblical story.

There is much in the history that is entirely in accordance with all that is known from external and contemporary sources. Palestine suffered from more than one invasion and settlement of foreigners, especially from the desert; tribes entered Egyptian territory to pasture; and there are many details in the Pentateuch and other portions of the O.T. which show a good knowledge of Egyptian conditions. The name Moses is Egyptian, and appears in Thutmose ('[the god] Thut is born')¹. Phinehas is 'the negro,' the Nubian; and Moses had a Cushite wife. The story of Joseph—who married an Egyptian wife—has several Egyptian traits.

¹ F. Ll. Griffith, in C. F. Burney, *Schweich Lectures* (1917), p. 47 n.

So, too, in Joshua's campaigns there is much that on topographical and even on military grounds is in itself perfectly credible. On the other hand, close examination reveals throughout serious discrepancies of historical background, range of interest, and religious spirit, such that the constituent elements cannot be due to one age or one circle. Modern biblical criticism rests partly upon numerous internal difficulties in the Pentateuch itself, partly also on the impossibility of understanding it if, in its present form, it is earlier than the great prophets whose teaching transformed Israel and her history. Briefly, the 'critical theory' amounts to this, that the highly-developed history, law, and ritual are, *in their present form*, of post-exilic date, that is, after the sixth century B.C., and that the Pentateuch (together with the book of Joshua) consists of much that is of exilic or post-exilic date, together with much that is earlier. Owing to the nature of the problem, opinions differ as to the precise dates of the constituent elements and of their historical value; but although many serious questions remain, the essential conclusion is that the early history of Israel, as it is impressed upon the reader in the O.T., is the last stage in a very complicated process. It is necessary, however, that the reader should know something of the evidence upon which some important conclusions have been based, although an adequate discussion would be much too technical for these pages¹. See also pp. 375, 383 *seqq.*

In the first place, there are no direct references in contemporary sources, either to the Exodus or to the Conquest². The events in the Amarna letters cannot be identified with Joshua's invasion from the south without entirely stultifying the biblical narrative. The Habiru, who are mentioned only in Abdi-Khiba's letters from Jerusalem, are evidently the *Sa.Gaz*, who are found also in the north with Abd-Ashirta, and can scarcely be the

¹ While the strongest arguments against the 'critical' position have indicated the weakness of *elaborate* 'reconstructions' based upon data which prove to be much more complicated than was thought, no alternative position and no other fruitful lines of enquiry have attracted serious attention.

² Four groups of theories have prevailed as to the Exodus. Broadly speaking, they associate themselves with (1) the Hyksos (*i.e.* before the XVIIIth Dynasty), (2) the age of Thutmose III and Amenhotep III and IV (the 'Amarna Age,' XVIIIth Dynasty); (3) the age of Ramses II and Merneptah (XIXth Dynasty); and (4) a later period (XXth Dynasty). Each of the groups has points in its favour, but deals so drastically with the biblical evidence that should any one of them be justified (through fresh external evidence), the very secondary character of the biblical narratives will only be more unmistakable. Most can be said in favour of (2) and (3); cf. p. 153 *sq.*

Israelites under Joshua. There is no agreement between the letters and the O.T. as regards the names of the kings of Jerusalem (Abdi-Khiba—Adoni-Zedek), Lachish (Yabniel, Zimrida—Yaphia), Gezer (Yapakhi [Yaphia]—Horam), and Hazor (Abdi-Tirshi—Yabin). Moreover, people were being sold for food to Yarimuta; and were actually fleeing for refuge to Egypt, where Syrian (Palestinian) officials, like Yankhamu and Dudu, could hold high positions. Palestine was still under Egyptian administration in the time of Ramses III; and not only is there no hint of this in the O.T., but the Canaanites or Amorites are there represented as independent. The divergence between the conditions as described in the O.T. and the contemporary evidence (see chap. XIII) is crucial. Nor can we find any contact later. If Israel built Pithom and Raamses in the time of Ramses II (Ex. i, 11: see above, p. 152 *sq.*), Merneptah's reference to Israel might seem to suggest that the Exodus had meanwhile intervened (p. 165 *sq.*). Yet, even if Israel had availed itself of the Libyan invasion of Egypt, and had fled from bondage into the southern wilderness, or even into Palestine, nomads (*Shasu*) were peacefully entering Egypt for pasturage, and the narratives hardly reflect Merneptah's age. If the foreign *Aperu*, who were employed as labourers as late as the days of Ramses III, are Hebrews (p. 328), they must have remained behind (although a mixed multitude went up, Ex. xii, 38)—to suppose that the Exodus had not yet taken place is against the chronology. The chronological details, however, are in any case inconclusive (vol. 1, p. 163 *sq.*).

The significant facts are: (a) the persistence and depth of Egyptian influence upon Palestine even in the thirteenth century B.C., (b) the early occurrence of the name of the Israelite tribal-district Asher (p. 319), and of such names as Jacob and Abram (vol. 1, pp. 233, 236); (c) the serious discrepancies between the O.T. and the external events, whatever view be taken of the date of the Exodus and the Conquest; and (d) the parallels between the culture illustrated in the Amarna letters, etc., and that of even the later books of the O.T. In fact, the excavations manifest no break in the cultural conditions such as there would have been had the Israelite invasion and conquest taken the form the narratives involve. The book of Genesis itself implies that there were Hebrews before there were Israelites; and since the Habiru movement could hardly, at the best, represent even the *first* Hebrew invasion—and there is nothing to identify it clearly with any event in Genesis—it must be concluded that the biblical narratives certainly represent traditions of various movements,

but that their actual character is a matter of conjecture. Some co-ordination of Egyptian and Palestinian (Judaean) history may be recognized in the notice of the relative antiquity of Tanis and Hebron (Num. xiii, 22). But how tradition and good history could be fused is sufficiently illustrated in the late Greek accounts of the expulsion of the Hyksos, especially if, as is still sometimes urged, the account of the Exodus represents the biblical version of this event (vol. I, p. 311). In a word, it becomes generally true that although we may assume that the O.T. narratives reflect some knowledge of invasions and other movements, and although there is external evidence for important movements (cf. also the time of Seti I, p. 135 above), the biblical accounts, as they stand, cannot be used by the historian.

II. THE ACCOUNT OF THE EXODUS AND THE CONQUEST

As the composite O.T. record now reads, the *family* of Jacob (Israel) went down into Egypt: the list (Gen. xlv) corresponds in general to that of the chief divisions of the Israelite *tribes*, the 'children of Israel' (Num. xxvi). An uncertain period intervenes, although Joseph, who went down as a youth, and lived 110 years, is said to have seen the children of Machir who occupied Gilead and received it from the hands of Moses (Gen. I, 23; Num. xxxii; vol. I, p. 163). Jacob died after seventeen years in Egypt, and a large company set out to bury him, but returned again (Gen. I). The 600,000 *men* of the Exodus itself (Ex. xii, 37)—not to mention the 'mixed multitude'—would point to a grand total of some two millions of Israelites: this is among the many real difficulties in the account of the Exodus and the life in the wilderness, and Doughty observes that the convoy of Israel would be more than 200 leagues long. If we reduce the figures—and in one account there are only two Hebrew midwives in Exodus (Ex. i, 15; cf. v. 10, the fear lest the people multiply)—the result is to destroy the effect of the whole narrative, especially of the conquest of Palestine. On the other hand, it is far from unlikely that the historical kernel is the descent and exodus of some relatively small band, perhaps, as is often thought, of a few tribes; and the first significant conclusion is that *not all Israel went down into Egypt and returned*: the original tradition must have been considerably reshaped.

Further, according to one version Jacob's family settled, not in and among the Egyptians, whom they despoiled when they left (cf. Ex. iii, 22, etc.), but apart, as shepherds, in the land of

Goshen (cf. viii, 22; ix, 26; x, 23). Goshen in Egypt (? by the Wadi Tūmilāt) has not been finally identified; and another Goshen is mentioned with Kadesh and Gaza in the south of Palestine (Josh. x, 41; xi, 16). This Goshen is in the vicinity of the 'River of Egypt' (the Wadi el-Arīsh), about 50 miles south-west of Gaza, and when Hagar, Abraham's concubine, and the 'mother' of Ishmael, is associated with the district, and is also called an 'Egyptian,' we have a noteworthy extension of the name Egypt, similar to the 'wilderness of the land of Egypt,' where Ezekiel evidently located the wanderings of the Israelites (xx, 36). Hence, it is also noteworthy that in three interrelated stories (a) Abram and his wife Sarai descend into Egypt to escape a famine, and the Pharaoh is plagued; (b) Abraham and his wife Sarah journey to Abimelech, in Gerar between Kadesh and Shur, and Abimelech suffers; and (c) Isaac and Rebekah, also to escape famine, go down to Abimelech, 'king of the Philistines,' in the district of Gerar and Beer-sheba (Gen. xii, xx, xxvi). In these circumstances we may conclude that traditions of an exodus from Egypt proper may well have been influenced by those of *some movement into Palestine from the eastern extension of Egypt*, a district here closely associated with the Philistines.

In the account of the entrance of Jacob-Israel with his Aramæan wives (see p. 369 sq.) there are traditions of an actual settlement; and these, in common with the tribal genealogies in 1 Chronicles (ii sqq.), ignore, and sometimes exclude, a descent into Egypt and an exodus (*ib.* vii, 20 sqq.). Jacob, it was said, bought ground at Shechem; indeed, he conquered the city, and had pasturing-grounds in the vicinity (Gen. xxxiii, 19; xxxvii, 12; xlviii, 22). Of this conquest later fancy has much to say, although it obviously conflicts with the tendency of the biblical narratives. But the story of Jacob's daughter, Dinah, and of Shechem, the 'son' of Hamor, is also that of some settlement; and Simeon and Levi are sternly condemned for their ferocity (xxxiv, 30; cf. xlix, 5-7): the original story has apparently been amplified to embrace all the tribes of Israel. The tribal fortunes of Reuben, too, are ostensibly determined by his incest (1 Chron. v, 1). Judah's marriage with the Canaanite (xxxviii) finds a parallel in that of Simeon (xlvi, 10), whose wife, according to a very late, but entirely consistent, tradition, was of Zephath (Jubilees xxxiv, 20; xlv, 33), the city taken by Simeon and Judah and renamed Hormah at the conquest under Joshua (Judg. i, 17). Such traditions of the 'patriarchs' and their deeds allow no room for any account of a sojourn in Egypt and an exodus; and they presuppose some

considerable body of tradition which has disappeared in favour of the now prevailing outline. This is the third significant conclusion, and it agrees with the view suggested by a general survey of the O.T. narrative: *not all the Hebrews or Israelites went down into Egypt; those who remained in the land would have traditions of settlement very different from those who took part in the Exodus; and of these traditions Genesis preserves fragments.*

The entrance of Abram to Shechem and his journey to Bethel and Hebron (p. 352) find a parallel in the steps of Jacob. The separation of each from Lot and Esau (Edom) respectively is also similar (Gen. xiii, 6; xxxvi, 6 sq.); and the two events, together with the line drawn between Isaac and Hagar (and Ishmael), represent *either*, three distinct occurrences in pre-Mosaic history *or*—more naturally—explanations of the difference felt, at different times, between Hebrews (or Israelites) and other groups, all of which, as the genealogical lists and topographical details prove, were very closely interconnected. Finally, there are striking parallels between the entrance of Jacob and his 'sons' and that of the Israelite tribes. Shechem is the scene of Joshua's great religious assembly before the dismissal of the tribes, and of Jacob's reforms before leaving for Bethel (Gen. xxxv, 1-5; Josh. xxiv). The 'house of Joseph' proceeds to Bethel, where the 'weeping' of Israel at Bochim finds its parallel in the 'oak of weeping,' also near Bethel (Judg. ii, 1-5; Gen. xxxv, 8). Judah and Simeon were the first to conquer the land allotted to them (Judg. i); and, while Judah 'at that time' departs and settles among the Canaanites (Gen. xxxviii, 1), the Canaanite alliances of Judah and Simeon have already been noticed. The similarities are too close to be accidental, and we may infer that *the original stories of the patriarchs did not lead up to the account of the Exodus and the Conquest.* The stories describe how the patriarchal figures come to be settled in the south: they represent a specifically South Palestinian point of view. The story of Joseph, it should be noticed, serves to combine traditions of settlement with those of a descent; it is the logical prelude to an exodus from Egypt and a conquest of the Promised Land. But the Egyptian names in it take us down to a much later age; and if the story has been used to connect the two groups of traditions, it is noteworthy that the account of Abram's descent into Egypt also breaks the main narrative¹.

¹ Gen. xii, 8 sq. compared with xiii, 3 sq. Not only is Joseph connected by marriage with the priesthood of Heliopolis (Gen. xli, 45), but the priesthood of Shiloh (Eli, etc.) is also traced back to Egypt (1 Sam. ii, 27, below, p. 371): some close connection between Egypt (proper) and Central Palestine stands out clearly in the traditions.

The history of Israel before the entrance into Palestine is viewed as a time of innocence (Jer. ii, 2 *sqq.*; Hosea ii, 15; ix, 10), a simple existence devoid of complex ritual (Amos v, 25); but by Ezekiel (xx) it is regarded as one long period of guilt. Sinai or Horeb—the present narratives seem to identify them—is the chief scene, but a closer examination of the details hardly confirms this. We read that food must be miraculously provided (Ex. xvi, Num. xi) although the people possessed cattle (Ex. xvii, 3; xix, 13; Num. xx, 4, 19, etc.). Not only are the two accounts of the provision of quails and manna parallel, but that in Exodus (xvi, 9–33) hints at the existence of the ark and sanctuary, and presupposes a later position in the narrative, after, and not before Sinai. Also, it alludes to a testing (v. 4), which at once points to the place Massah, the name of which means ‘proving, tempting’ (Deut. vi, 16, ix, 22). Moreover, the provision of water at the rock of the waters of Meribah (‘strife, contention’) is not at Sinai, but Kadesh (Num. xx, 1–14; xxvii, 14); and it finds a parallel in the miracle at the rock of Massah and Meribah (Ex. xvii, 1–7), which likewise is out of place before Sinai. Again, the Amalekites, defeated by Joshua, belong more naturally to south Palestine than to the Sinaitic peninsula, and to a later period, after the introduction of the young Joshua in Ex. xxxiii, 11. Similarly, Jethro’s visit to Moses and the inauguration of judges (Ex. xviii) point to a later stage (v. 5 refers to Sinai, which is not reached until xix), and with this agrees the summary in Deut. i, 9–18. That is to say, the account of the journey to Sinai from the ‘Red Sea’ (‘Sea of Reeds’; the precise identification is uncertain) is built up of stories that belong to a later stage, and are, in part at least, connected with Kadesh—the ‘Well of Judgment’ (Gen. xiv, 7). It is noteworthy, therefore, that the statement of the passage from the ‘Red Sea’ to Shur and the waters of Marah refers to a ‘proving’ (cf. Massah, above), and suggests that Israel came direct to Kadesh (Ex. xv, 22 *sqq.*)—from Egypt. On the other hand, the natural routes from Egypt eastwards are (a) by the sea-coast to Gaza, (b) the caravan route to Beer-sheba and Hebron, leaving Kadesh on the south, and (c) the familiar route, south of Kadesh, to the Gulf of Akabah. This gulf itself is also called the ‘Sea of Reeds’ (1 Kings ix, 26),* and to add to our difficulties Judg. xi, 16 speaks of the journey of Israel from Egypt *through the wilderness* to the ‘Sea of Reeds’—evidently outside Egypt proper—and thence to Kadesh.

Now Kadesh (presumably ‘*Ain Kadīs*’) lies about 50 miles south of Beer-sheba; the site of Sinai and Horeb, if they are really identical, is disputed. Many scholars argue strongly for the

traditional Jebel Mūsā, or, better, for Jebel Serbāl: both are in the south of the peninsula of Sinai. If so, Israel marched from Egypt into what was virtually an Egyptian dependency. But tribes from this district, or from the mines of the not distant Serabit el-Khadim, may have escaped into Palestine, and their tradition of a flight from this Egyptian dependency may have helped to develop the present narratives. Further, Jethro, the Midianite father-in-law of Moses, lived near Horeb (Ex. iii), and Midian may be located in north-west Arabia, where there are remains of once active volcanoes, such as might have formed the foundation of the very impressive scene at Mt Sinai (Ex. xix)¹. It is true that Midian is a somewhat fluid term in the O.T. (extending from north Sinai round to the east of Moab); but it is a striking fact that some names of its divisions also appear in Judæan and Reubenite lists, and that there are some interesting points of similarity between O.T. cultus and that of the Minaeans, a colony of whom lived—though at an uncertain date—at el-Ōlā in north Arabia. A movement into Palestine of Arabian tribes is not out of the question. Moreover, there were well-established routes between the head of the Gulf of Akabah, and both Egypt and Gaza, and also between the former and the region east of the Jordan. The view that Sinai-Horeb was near Kadesh would certainly remove some of the inconsistencies noted above; on the other hand, the statement that an eleven-days' journey separated them (Deut. i, 2) agrees with the fact that the father-in-law of Moses lived at some distance from the Israelite camp (Ex. xviii, 27; Num. x, 30), which, on other grounds, appears to have been at Kadesh. These and many other difficulties have not yet been adequately explained, and it is possible that separate traditions of Sinai and of Horeb were combined, and were introduced with the help of Ex. xiii, 17 *sq.* This passage explains that the people who left Egypt (proper) did not take the natural course direct into Palestine in order that they might avoid war, although this observation is really stultified in the present narratives by the subsequent story of the battle with the Amalekites (Ex. xvii).

The help rendered by the father-in-law of Moses (Ex. xviii) is otherwise initiated by Moses in Deut. i, 9 *sqq.*; and, when Moses requests his kinsman's company on the journey (Num. x, 29, here called Hobab) the sequel is lost, although he is found later in Judah (Judg. i). More weight is laid upon the presence of the ark (Num. x, 33), the pillar of cloud and fire (xiv, 14), the angel (Ex. xiv, 19; xxxii, 34), and the Divine Presence itself (xxxiii,

¹ Cf. Jebel Harāb (7710 feet), 36° long. east and 28° lat. north?

14). There are also obscure references to a hornet sent to prepare the way (Ex. xxiii, 28; Josh. xxiv, 12). The diffidence of Moses to undertake his great task is variously removed (Ex. xxxiii, Num. xi); and although the assistance of Aaron is promised at a very early stage (Ex. iv, 14), he plays only a secondary part in the older narratives. Again, the story of the appointment of seventy elders (Ex. xxxiii, but see already xxiv) breathes a fine catholicity; but it is marred when the two 'outsiders,' Eldad and Medad, who also receive the gift of the spirit—although they are not of the elect—are said to have been already on the register, and were therefore not entirely outside the pale. Other stories tell of supremacy (*e.g.* that of Moses over Miriam and Aaron, Num. xii); and the very composite story of Korah inculcates the supremacy of Levites over non-Levites, and of priestly over non-priestly Levites (Num. xvi). A distinction is also drawn between Nadab and Abihu, the (ritually) impious sons of Aaron himself and their brethren (Lev. x, with a play upon Kadesh, 'holy'). Here, once more, we are to recognize, *either* actual vicissitudes, similar, though with many subtle differences, *or* we may more naturally treat them as efforts to throw back to the traditional beginnings of Israelite national history various ecclesiastical vicissitudes, rivalries and developments which can also be traced in the post-exilic books of Chronicles and elsewhere. To the excessively complex religious and ecclesiastical developments in later Israelite history there correspond the intricate details in the narrative of the inauguration of Judaism.

Another striking example of this 'reflexion' is afforded by the story of the Golden Calf, for the construction of which Aaron was responsible, and nearly lost his life (Ex. xxxii; Deut. ix, 20). This cult was once orthodox in the northern kingdom, and its foundation is also ascribed to Jeroboam, the first king after (north) Israel broke away from Judah. Indeed, Jeroboam's sons are called Nadab and Abijah (*cf.* the names of Aaron's sons), and his words to the people are also those of Aaron, 'Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt' (1 Kings xii, 28). It was on the occasion of this 'idolatry' that the Levites distinguished themselves by their fiery zeal and were consecrated. As the Levites are elsewhere blessed for their staunchness (Deut. xxxiii, 8 *sqq.*), the unfavourable attitude to the affair at Shechem (Gen. xlix, 5-7, above) will either refer to some earlier historical event (though no very satisfactory explanation has yet been found), or it represents quite another feeling touching the character of these zealots. In the latter case, we may compare the

widely divergent attitudes to the sanguinary reforms by the Rechabites at the second great landmark in north Israelite history, the rise of the dynasty of Jehu (see 2 Kings x, and Hosea i, 4). The story of the calf-worship, thus ascribed variously to the first king of the schismatic north, or to Aaron himself, leads on to the account of a new covenant. Moses in his wrath breaks the tables of the Decalogue, and when new ones are made and rewritten, the narrative presents a series of laws more archaic in some respects and less ethical in others than the Decalogue itself (Ex. xx, xxxiv). The people now strip themselves of their jewels, not, as before, to make the calf, but for an unspecified reason (xxxiii, 6; cf. xxxii, 2). There follows, however, a fragment describing how Moses would pitch him a Tent, the Tent of Meeting, not the elaborate Tabernacle, the details of which have long been a stumbling-block to the credibility of the narratives, but a modest sanctuary, guarded, not by innumerable Levites, but by Joshua, who is here introduced as for the first time. It is not, like the Tabernacle, the central object of the national camp of all the Israelite tribes, but outside it (xxxiii, 7-11). It is introduced after Yahweh's refusal to accompany the erring people and before the promise of his 'presence.' It is apparently at this stage that the Ark was made, and the Tables placed in it (Deut. x)—though it is questioned whether this was its original purpose. Some more complete tradition must once have existed of this Tent and all its contents—and of the use made of the people's jewels—but it has been ignored in favour of the present detailed and late description of the gorgeous Tabernacle, as explained to Moses (Ex. xxv-xxx) and as actually constructed (xxxv-xl), largely through the help of Bezalel, of the Judæan clan Caleb, and Aholiab the Danite (xxx, 1-11).

The book of Leviticus is of ritual rather than of direct historical importance; and the opening chapters of Numbers deal, *inter alia*, with the preparations for the journey into Palestine. When at last this is undertaken, ostensibly from Sinai (Num. x, 29), we find the closest connection between Yahweh's commands and the complaints of Moses in Ex. xxxiii, 1-3 and Num. xi. 11-15. This is intelligible when we consider the nature of the intervening material, which has, in fact, broken the earlier thread. The scene, however, is not Sinai, but the wilderness of Paran (Sinai being left behind, Num. x, 12); it is approximately the ancient Edom, which stretched east and west between Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula. The district in general is famous as the scene of great historic theophanies (Deut. xxxiii, 2; Judg. v, 4; Hab. iii, 3), and

of Elijah's visit to Horeb shortly before the rise of the dynasty of Jehu (1 Kings xix).

After the return of spies who had been sent into Palestine (from Kadesh, Num. xiii, 26)—the original story should preferably come before Num. xx, 14—the lack of faith of the Israelites is punished by the infliction of forty years of wandering in the district, and they are ordered to journey round by the head of the Gulf of Akabah. In defiance of Yahweh, and without the protection of Moses and the Sacred Ark (as in x, 35 sq.), an attempt was made to strike northwards. It led to a disastrous defeat, and Amalekites and Canaanites beat them back as far as Hormah (xiv). But elsewhere (xxi, 1–3) we read that Israel, after suffering defeat at the hands of the Canaanites (Arad, 50 miles north of Kadesh, is mentioned), utterly destroyed ('banned') them and their cities, with Yahweh's help, whence the origin of the name Hormah, 'ban.' This victory at the very gates of the Promised Land—Arad lies 17 miles south of Hebron—is of extreme importance because, as the story of the conquest now reads, the tribes Judah and Simeon, after the circuitous journey round by the east of the Dead Sea, entered under Joshua, and, moving south, ultimately took Zephath and called it Hormah (Judg. i), and in this district these tribes have their seat. The tribes practically describe a circle. Accordingly, not only are there different accounts of the seizure of the district of Hormah, but one of them really implies the tradition of a successful movement of Israel (or rather of some part of it) northwards into south Palestine, and is quite distinct from the tradition of the circuitous route, round by the Gulf of Akabah, for which, however, the story of the defeat at Hormah very naturally prepares the way.

There are discrepant traditions as to Kadesh and the scene of the years of wandering, whether before reaching Kadesh or after leaving it; and, just as the traditions of the Exodus of Egypt have been extended to include all Israel, so the fragment of the movement into south Palestine can hardly be true of all Israel, but only of certain elements which have yet to be determined. Kadesh (see p. 344, n. 1) lay at what was, at some period, the border of Israel and Edom (Josh. xv, 3; Num. xx, 16)—to the north are Amalekites and Canaanites, to the east Edom; and this representation, together with precise references to Edom, Moab and Ammon, point to a time when these and Israel were clearly understood as distinct entities. Edom violently refused to allow his 'brother' Israel to pass through—distinct 'brother' peoples

exist; but in another version Israel journeyed direct to Moab (Num. xx, 22-29; xxxiii, 37). Here there is no hostile feeling, for, just as Israel has his own land, so Yahweh had given Mt Seir to Esau (*i.e.* Edom, Deut. ii; xxxiii, 7). Yet, as lists of caravan-stations are preserved, and as the route along the east of the fertile districts of Edom and Moab is that of the later pilgrim-road between Arabia and Syria, the tradition of an independent journey from some Midianite area in north Arabia may lie behind the present highly-complicated sources. Indeed we cannot ignore the possibility of a separation of tribes, and a twofold journey along the west and along the east of the Dead Sea. However, it must suffice to have mentioned some of the difficulties which have led scholars to attempt reconstructions of the early history.

Although Moab and Ammon are left untouched—because the children of Lot had received their land from Yahweh (Deut. ii, 9)—the story of Balaam, the son of Beor, who is associated with Aram (? read Edom), and also with Ammon (some versions in Num. xxii, 5), represents Moabite (and Midianite) hostility to Israel. Balaam, a worshipper of Yahweh (Num. xxii, 18), called upon to curse, utters a blessing; but he acquires a bad reputation, and becomes a by-word for idolatry and vice. Moab is also the scene of Israelite apostasy at Baal-Peor (Num. xxv); Midian, too, is involved, and in a holy war Midian is exterminated, and Balaam, responsible for the seduction of the people (xxxii, 16), is slain with five kings of Midian who, however, are elsewhere princes of the Amorite king Sihon (*v.* 8)! Indeed, according to a relatively old source, Sihon had seized Moabite territory from Heshbon to Arnon; and an old poem of the fall of Moab refers to some conquest, not (like that of Israel) from the south, but from the north (Num. xxi). At all events, Israel overcomes both Sihon and a more northerly Amorite chief, Og of Bashan, and thereby the Trans-Jordanic country is gained (Deut. ii *sq.*; in Judg. xi Ammon's complaint really refers to Moab). The land is allotted to Reuben and Gad—freely (Deut. iii, 12-21), or on condition that they help the other tribes (Num. xxxii *sqq.*); but their actual territories overlap both with each other and with Moab. It is evident that the data cannot refer to any single period, and that they represent different historical circumstances.

As regards Edom, an independent account of Esau's marriages and the Edomite subdivisions (Gen. xxxvi) unmistakably represents a very extensive and self-conscious unit stretching across south Palestine, with relations with the sub-divisions of Judah and Benjamin. The connection between Judah and the south was

particularly close at certain periods, and the south often exercised considerable influence in Judah—up to the day of the 'Idumaeon' (*i.e.* Edomite) Herod. Now, according to some passages, the Israelites encountered the indigenous Horites, and giants like Og of Bashan (Deut. ii, 9 *sq.*), Anakim, and the cedar-high Amorites (Amos ii, 9), prehistoric and heroic worthies like the Rephaim, and the Nephilim, born of fallen angels and the daughters of men (Gen. vi, 4). We seem to have here the point of view of people from the desert. Caleb and the spies had seen the Nephilim (Num. xiii, 33), and he, 'the servant of Yahweh,' conquered Hebron and its 'sons of Anak,' while his nephew Othniel gained Kirjath-Sepher. Other conquests over 'Anakim' and kindred people will be mentioned later. But although Caleb's deeds are subordinated to the Israelite conquest (Josh. xv, 13–19, Judg. i, 10–20), we may recognize a once independent cycle, a distinct movement from the south into Judah, which will include not only Caleb (who was of Edomite affinity), but also his 'brother' Jerahmeel, who was partly of 'Egyptian' origin (1 Chron. ii, 34). Dan, too, may be associated with this tradition, and there are indications of the further movement of Calebites from the south of Judah to the vicinity of Jerusalem (1 Chron. ii) and of Dan from a seat south-west of Ephraim to the extreme north, near Phoenician territory (Judg. xvii *sq.*).

Both Dan and Naphtali are sons of Jacob's concubine Bilhah; and Naphtali, in turn, may be originally connected with cities near the southern Dan (Deut. xxxiii, 23). Simeon and Levi are associated with Shechem in central Palestine (Gen. xxxiv; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv, 6); Kenites, the clan of Moses' father-in-law, are found in the north near Kadesh in Naphtali (Judg. iv, 11; contrast i, 16), and the lists of Asher contain some names of southern connection. The name Bilhah itself not only recalls the Edomite and Benjamite Bilhan, but is traditionally connected with Reuben who, once the 'first-born,' forfeited his tribal priority (see Gen. xxxv, 22; xlix, 3 *sq.*). Reubenite elements appear in the older account of the revolt of Korah (which, too, is an Edomite name); and, since a Reubenite name is even found in Palestine (Josh. xv, 6; xviii, 17), it would seem that at one time Reuben was a pretty extensive district. Whatever be the true explanation of the data, it is evident that there were tribal divisions earlier than and different from that which became familiar¹.

Besides the prominence given to the deeds of Reuben and Gad

¹ On this, see especially Burney's discussion, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* (the Schweich Lectures for 1917). See further, below, p. 389 *sq.*

in Palestine on behalf of Israel (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 21), elsewhere clans of South Palestinian origin are connected with settlements in Gilead (1 Chron. ii, 21 *sq.*). When Jacob left Isaac (between Kadesh and Shur), he proceeded, according to one account, direct to the Aramaean Laban, in the north-east of Palestine (Gen. xxviii. *sq.*). These and other notices seem to point to definite traditions of a northward movement into Palestine and east Jordan on the part of clans or tribes who are not precisely the tribes of Israel. The current tribal scheme is in any case relatively late, and a close examination inevitably suggests that it has displaced earlier representations and arrangements. When Leah is the first, though not the favourite, wife of Jacob-Israel, some priority or greater antiquity is apparently attributed to the divisions incorporated under the names of Leah's children (Reuben, Simeon, Levi and Judah), as distinct from the Rachel tribes (Manasseh, Ephraim and Benjamin). Different claims were made, for, although Reuben was once recognized as the firstborn, Judah and Joseph contend for priority (1 Chron. v, 1 *sq.*). But it must be freely recognized that it is easier to discover conflicting representations than to find among the theories that have been proposed one that explains them satisfactorily. The importance of some specific body of southern tradition is, however, unmistakable, and it is further enhanced by what is known of the Levites, their distribution over Palestine, and their subsequent congregating around Jerusalem. The names of the Levitical divisions are closely connected with Moses and his family, and also with Judah and south Palestine, Edom included. Their entrance and distribution could readily account for some of the traditions of migration and movement; and it is noteworthy that among the biblical traditions are some which represent specifically south Palestinian and local standpoints, and that certain families of the scribes were akin to the clans who definitely claimed a south Palestinian or Edomite origin (1 Chron. ii, 55). In this way we could explain the *presence* in the O.T. of various traditions, although whether they are trustworthy is quite another question. Nor can we say that the historical events they reflect necessarily belong to the pre-monarchical age.

Although Israel was composed, to some extent at least, of Edomite elements, the 'father' of the tribes is also called an Aramaean (Deut. xxvi, 5). His wives, Leah and Rachel, are represented as Aramaeans, and their home was probably, not the distant Harran, the seat of the ancient moon-cult, but some nearer and more desert-like locality. How far south the term

Aram (which in the consonantal Hebrew text differs only by a 'tittle' from Edom) could extend is uncertain; it probably reached to the Edomite area, and some tribes could be regarded therefore as either Aramaean or Edomite¹. The term is more especially associated with the northern region and Damascus. It covers Geshur and Maacah; but the latter also included (according to the true text of 2 Sam. xx, 18) the genuinely 'Israelite' cities of Abel and Dan. The Danite Laish lay in the Aramaean Beth-rehob (Judg. xviii, 28; 2 Sam. x, 6), and Machir, the 'father' of Gilead, is regarded as partly Aramaean (1 Chron. vii, 14; cf. ii, 23). The northern and eastern fringes of Israel were exposed to the inroad of Aramaean elements; and it is not improbable that there was some sweeping movement, an entrance of Aramaeans, who settled down and adopted the Hebrew language of the land.

The activity of the Habiru in the Amarna letters is thought by some scholars to reflect an Aramaean movement. And when the Moabites are called 'sons of Sheth' (Num. xxiv, 17, R.V. mg.), the reference may be to the Sutu bedouins who are mentioned with the Habiru (see pp. 299, 405, and vol. I, p. 234). The parallel between Jacob's entry and settlement and Joshua's invasions has already been noticed (p. 360). Though so much is uncertain, the stories of Jacob-Israel do seem to echo two fundamental traditions when they combine (a) Jacob's journey from the south of Palestine to the north and north-east, whether by way of Bethel or direct (Gen. xxviii, 10); and (b) his entry, with his Aramaean wives and family, after separating from Laban the Aramaean, Mizpah being evidently regarded as marking the boundary between Israelite and Aramaean soil. Hence there are two accounts of a theophany at Bethel, and of the change of the name from Jacob to Israel (Gen. xxviii, xxxii, 28, xxxv, 9; cf. Hos. xii, 4). Into further details it is impossible to enter here; but with such contrary traditions of the Edomite and of the Aramaean constitution of Israel the intricacy of the present narratives becomes readily intelligible.

III. THE ACCOUNT OF THE RISE OF THE MONARCHY

The account of the conquests of Joshua does not record the occupation of central Palestine. Joshua is associated with Timnath-heres (? Tibneh, north-west of Bethel), and Joseph's bones were conveyed from Egypt to Shechem; but the capture of this

¹ Similarly, centuries later, the line between Aramaean and Arab tribes east of the Jordan was very vague.

district, though implied, is nowhere described. Yet the account of the solemn assembly at Mt Ebal, and of Joshua's altar (Josh. viii, 30), when read in the light of the command of Moses (Deut. xxvii), should be the prelude to the work of occupation. Although Joshua's camp was at Gilgal near Jericho, there may have been some confusion with a Gilgal near Mt Ebal (Deut. xi, 30), and possibly, also, a tradition of some crossing of the Jordan opposite Shechem, analogous to the entry of the great ancestors Abraham and Jacob, and their journey to Shechem. Jacob, as we know, was also regarded as a conqueror of Shechem (Gen. xlviii, 22; p. 359); and central Palestine, it was perhaps thought, was already Israelite before the conquest. But if we do not hear how it was taken, we at least learn something of its expansion. The 'children of Joseph' (Manasseh and Ephraim), being in need of more territory, are enjoined to seize it (Josh. xvii, 14 *sqq.*); and the capture of Bethel, previously mentioned among the conquests of Joshua, is also ascribed to the 'house of Joseph' (Judg. i, 22). Both Ephraim and Benjamin were fierce fighters, and stories are told of the wrath of the former when they were not called up to aid Gideon (of Manasseh) in routing Midian, and Jephthah (of Gilead) in his defeat of Ammon (Judg. viii, xii). If, as seems probable, Machir was once west of the Jordan (v, 14), his conquests, though associated (like Caleb's) with the work of Moses (Num. xxxii, 40), may be part of a movement from the west, and this will explain the otherwise strange appearance of the tribe of Manasseh on both sides of the Jordan.

In striking contrast to the impression we gain of a great sweeping movement from Egypt into Palestine are the more individual and isolated movements, illustrated further in the stories of Dinah (some clan related to Dan?), Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv), and Joseph, Judah and Simeon (Judg. i). The killing of Eglon by the Benjamite Ehud freed Ephraim from a Moabite occupation (Judg. iii), the defeat of Jabin of Hazor saved Zebulun and Naphtali (iv); and Gideon of Abiezer, Jephthah of Gilead, and Samson of Dan are primarily of somewhat local importance, though the exploits of these 'judges' are fitted into the history of a great and united Israel. In the ancient Song of Deborah (v) the Israel that is there threatened is disunited. There is, to be sure, an extraordinary story of the gathering of all Israel from Dan to Beer-sheba to blot out the iniquity of Benjamin (Judg. xix-xxi). But it falls outside the scheme of the 'judges' and certainly represents late ideas. Though unhistorical, its presence is noteworthy, and for three reasons: (a) Benjamin is

virtually wiped out, and is rebuilt by intermarriage with aliens of Jabesh in Gilead and of Shiloh. But, in the narratives that follow, Benjamin is the tribe of Saul, who has relations with Gilead, and the tribe is singularly important. Next, (b), the people are under Phinehas the grandson of Aaron; but in the preceding story of the origin of the sanctuary of Dan, after theft, rapine and murder, a Levite of Bethlehem, the grandson of Moses, is the priest of the place where Jeroboam set up a golden calf (Judg. xvii sq.). Finally, (c), Israel is a religious community and the ark is at Bethel; but, in the subsequent chapters, the ark is at Shiloh (cf. also Josh. xviii, 1) under the priestly family of Eli, which had been chosen in Egypt, but which, for the infamy of the sons of Eli (one of whom is named Phinehas), is threatened with extinction. The rise of a faithful and permanent priesthood is heralded, and we may recognize an allusion to the coming supremacy of the Jerusalem priest Zadok (later reckoned as an Aaronite) over Abiathar, who himself is said to be of the family of Eli (1 Sam. ii sq., 1 Kings ii).

The biblical narratives as a whole fluctuate between the sweeping conquest by a united Israel of a thoroughly alien people and references to a more gradual settlement; the last is for good reasons—lest the wild beasts multiply (Ex. xxiii, 29; cf. 2 Kings xvii, 24 sqq.), and for training in war (see Judg. iii, 1–6). But, so far from maintaining their independence, the Israelites intermarried with the native population, who in fact continued to hold some of the most important cities. These cities commanded the chief routes, and virtually severed central Palestine from the tribes to the south and north. Saul attempted to exterminate the Gibeonites (2 Sam. xxi, 2), David took Jerusalem from the Jebusites (v), and Solomon completed the work of subjugation (1 Kings ix, 20 sq.), and to him is accordingly ascribed the building or fortification of some important sites. In the light of such evidence it is difficult to trace the history of the rise of the monarchy. Saul, with all his zeal and piety, made no effort to capture the city which Yahweh had chosen to set his name there, yet Saul was a godly and successful king, and his deeds really imply a united Israel as surely as do those ascribed to Joshua and Samuel.

Of the two conflicting accounts of the rise of the first king of Israel (p. 354), the later one, which regards the monarchy as an offence, follows upon Samuel's defeat of the Philistines, who, however, are also called Amorites (1 Sam. vii, 14); but, in the earlier, there is a picture of Philistine oppression and Israelite distress to which there is no clear prelude (ix). It has been lost, although

the introduction to the story of Jephthah the Gileadite, which describes the required situation in Palestine itself, has no obvious sequel (Judg. x, 6-16). This fact renders it impossible to recover any historical continuity, unless we may conjecture that, according to some old tradition, Saul immediately followed Jephthah. Saul, like Jephthah, saved Gilead from the Ammonites; but, although he was raised up by Yahweh to deliver Israel from the Philistines, his son Jonathan becomes the hero of the story, and Saul is placed in a most unfavourable light. He is rejected by Yahweh almost before he has begun to reign (1 Sam. xiii sq.). Instead of the brave king, and the love between him and Jonathan, as set forth in the secular poem quoted from the Book of Jashar (2 Sam. i), we have a jealous and half-insane Benjamite opposed to the glorious ruddy hero, David of Bethlehem. It is David, the first king of Judah, who is the central figure of some of the finest specimens of Hebrew story, and upon him writers lavish their best. We read the history of the monarchy through Judæan spectacles. David wins his spurs by slaying a Philistine giant, who is identified with Goliath; but this worthy is elsewhere said to have been slain by Elhanan (1 Sam. xvii, 4, see p. 393). Much is told of David's valour and growing popularity, and of his unceasing friendship with Jonathan, who thus earns his father's enmity; and David's generosity to Saul's family is strongly impressed upon some of the narratives of David's reign as king—but not upon all.

David of Bethlehem is otherwise associated with south Judah, or with Philistine territory (Ziklag, Gath); his marriage alliances are with the south, and his policy is to win over south Judæan cities (1 Sam. xxx). Only at the death of Saul does he move up with his companions and become king over the 'house of Judah,' at Hebron, about 20 miles south of Jerusalem. Saul himself had been disastrously defeated in the north at Mt Gilboa by the Philistines; and the presence of this people, so far from the cities usually associated with them (Ekron, Gath, etc., p. 291), points to some sweeping attack upon Israel. Saul's body was exposed at Beth-shean; but the faithful men of Jabesh-Gilead secretly removed it, and the court was transferred across the Jordan. Saul's son Ish-baal—the form Ish-bosheth ('man of shame') is an artificial avoidance of the name of an abominated god—was made king at Mahanaim by Abner, his father's general, and reigned over Israel and Gilead. He recovered central Palestine from the Philistines, but by what means we are not told. David, who had already friendly relations with Moab (1 Sam. xxii, 3), tried, per-

haps successfully, to win over Gilead. Ammon, as Israel's foe, was also worth winning; and, as a matter of fact, David subsequently found good friends in Barzillai of Gilead and Nahash of Ammon¹. The general situation is that of Judah *versus* (north) Israel, a Judah availing itself of Israelite difficulties.

In the fighting that ensued Ishbaal gradually grew weaker, and at last Abner plotted to seize the throne (2 Sam. iii, 6 *sqq.*). Brought to book, he went over to David, representing to Israel that David had been divinely appointed to deliver them from the Philistines. Ishbaal was slain by two officers of Beeroth, a non-Israelite city associated with Gibeon, Chephirah and Kirjath-jearim (Josh. ix, 17); and to the Gibeonites, who had not forgotten some attempt of Saul to extirpate the remnant of the Amorites, David handed over seven unoffending descendants of the king (2 Sam. xxi). He himself took Michal, Saul's daughter, from her husband, and, in accordance with oriental ideas, further strengthened his position over Israel by appropriating Saul's wives (iii, 13; xii, 8). The estate occupied by his son Absalom near Bethel (xiii, 23), and that given to Abiathar, his priest (1 Kings ii, 26), were doubtless not the only lands which David had seized (cf. 2 Sam. ix, 7). It is not surprising, therefore, that his kingdom should be loosely knit together, and that Judah and Israel remained rivals, with easily kindled passions. The men of the north claimed to be 'first-born rather than Judah' (so the true text in 2 Sam. xix, 43); and the stories of David's nephew and general, Joab, and the murder of Abner and of Amasa (iii, xx) are typical of the deep internal jealousies which repeatedly shook the Judæan and Israelite kingdoms in later centuries.

Some narratives present a picture of an inevitable and already existent rivalry—Israel *versus* Judah (cf. p. 355)—whether under Saul or David. The death of Saul would, of course, bring to the front the problem of the relations between the two sections. But as David moves up from the south to the capture of Jerusalem he fights 'Philistines,' and there are encounters at Gath, Bethlehem (where was a garrison), the valley of Rephaim, and elsewhere (2 Sam. v, xxi, xxiii). Further, we meet with giants, 'the sons of Raphah' (xxi, 16), and are back again at that primitive standpoint which knows of Caleb's defeat of 'sons of Anak' at Hebron, and of the overthrow of Anakim in the hill-country and the lowland (Josh. xi, 21 *sqq.*)—primitive worthies who, in fact, are also otherwise called Philistines (cf. Josh. xi, 22 with xiii, 3). David

¹ 2 Sam. ii, 5 *sqq.* x. In xvii, 27 'Shobi [the son of Nahash]' has probably arisen from a corruption of the needed verb 'brought.'

and his men are in alien country: such a tradition knows nothing of the relations between David of Bethlehem and Saul of Benjamin, or of Saul's rule over Judaeans, or of the settled conditions after Samuel's victory. Moreover, Jebusites hold Jerusalem, and from Araunah David must buy the site upon which was built the temple. Near his palace lived the Hittite captain Uriah, the husband of Bath-sheba, the heroine of David's sin, the first act in the vivid story of the revolt of Absalom, which relentlessly depicts the internal weakness of the Davidic kingdom, and the retribution for the blood-shed upon which it had been founded (2 Sam. xvi, 8).

Without going into further detail, it will now be seen that these varying accounts which culminate in the rise of the monarchy can hardly be resolved into a single, simple outline of events. Modern reconstructions of the early history of Israel invariably have to reject as 'unhistorical' all that which conflicts with what is regarded as 'historical.' The general outline of the biblical history really excludes the string of alien cities (Gibeon, Beeroth, Kirjath-jearim, Gezer and Jerusalem), which were so situated that, until David's capture of the Jebusite city, north and south were hardly one. Hence the not unnatural conjectures that David was the real creator of Judah as a political unit, and that Saul had no power south of Benjamin. The popular stories of Saul, Jonathan and David combine to present a picture which scarcely harmonizes either with the references to Saul's greatness or with the movements of David in an alien country. The powerful Saul, the first king of (north) Israel, and David, the founder of the Judaeen dynasty, stand apart. On the other hand, those narratives which unite them, while discrediting the first king of the north, enlarge upon the friendship between the unfortunate Jonathan and the young David. They thus serve to unite Judah and Benjamin, and reconcile in some measure the jealous pride of Judah and (north) Israel in their respective heroes. Benjamin is a relatively late tribal name; its land, debatable land, lay between Judah and Ephraim (a 'son' of Joseph). In the Genesis story Joseph is very friendly disposed towards his young 'brother,' Benjamin, whose name ('son of the right-hand,' *i.e.* the south) points to dependence upon the powerful northern neighbour. But the land is also connected with the friendly Judah (*cf.* Gen. xxxvii, 22, 26 *sq.*), and includes Jerusalem (Josh. xviii, 16). Indeed, the term Ephrath, which is applied to Bethlehem, might even suggest an original southward extension of Ephraim; and, in this case, the union of Judah and Benjamin would be at Ephraim's expense.

Many generations after Saul's time there were valiant Benjamites who claimed him as their ancestor (1 Chron. viii, 40), and who would have an interest in their ancestral traditions, as naturally as had the families of scribes, whose associations are with the Kenites, and with the clans of Caleb and Jerahmeel, which had come from the Edomite south (1 Chron. ii). Hence, as we have already noticed the prominence of southern traditions, so we can now recognize efforts to give expression to Benjamite local tradition. We may even perceive signs of artificial adjustment. Thus, we may observe how, in the account of the defeat of Sisera by Barak and Deborah, both of whom belonged to the northern tribes, Deborah is artificially connected with a Benjamite locality between Ramah and Bethel (Judg. iv, 4). The other characteristic tendency appears when the record of the 'judges' of the Israelites is prefaced by a veritable 'philosophy of history' illustrated, not by some popular story, but by most meagre details of a great defeat of a northern Aramaean power by Caleb's brother Othniel, the son of Kenaz, a thoroughly Edomite name (ii sq.).

Thus, the criticism of the biblical narratives is, in the first instance, 'literary-historical' criticism, namely, that of narratives which, whether they do or do not represent the past in a trustworthy manner, invariably throw light upon the age to which they belong, the interests they represent, the classes for whom they were written and the districts in which they circulated. Hence we are obliged continually to look forward to the later vicissitudes which seem to explain the existing composite records, and we are unable to present any straightforward description of the history of Israel before and even during the rise of David. Further, if in the preceding pages no attention has been paid to 'literary' criticism, and the sources commonly known as Yahwist (or Jehovist), Elohist, Deuteronomic and Priestly, it is because there are data which often go behind the purely 'literary criticism'; and these must first be taken into consideration, whatever view one may adopt touching the literary sources. The writers of the Old Testament did not propose to present an objective history of the past; but in their attitude to the past, and in the traditions they use or reshape, they give expression to certain religious, political and other aims which are ultimately of real historical significance, though they do not illumine the period now under discussion. We recover much that is of extreme importance for a later period, nor are we without much that is pregnant for the earlier. See further, pp. 385 sqq.

IV. PALESTINE, PHOENICIA AND THE PHILISTINES

Before we resume the biblical history we must briefly notice the main facts that have first to be taken into account. The striking differences between our ideas of Syria and Palestine, based on external and contemporary evidence (chap. XIII), and the impressions conveyed by the O.T. become explicable when it is remembered that the biblical history, the earliest known piece of continuous history, is of composite origin and the last stage in a lengthy literary process. The country in which the patriarchs of Israel live and move—and for the most part in serenity—like the alien land into which the conquering tribes of Israel were led by Moses and by Joshua, was in reality one of ancient and thoroughly organized conditions. It had long been inhabited by Semites who, whether they should be styled Amorites or Canaanites, were very closely akin to those whom we call Hebrews or Israelites¹. Indeed, in spite of a long succession of foreign (non-Semitic) influences, there is, on the whole, a certain continuous cultural history; and when allowance is made for Aegean, Philistine, Cypriote, Greek, Roman and Byzantine influence upon the pottery, there remains a certain interrelation or continuity: even the late 'Arab' (Mohammedan) ware bears a resemblance, which is often not a little remarkable, to the old painted pottery of ten or more centuries earlier. Similarly, notwithstanding the apparently deep-reaching influence of Greeks and Romans, old types of belief and custom have persisted, and the old names, carefully preserved among the people, have emerged as the exotic influences decayed, so that typical vicissitudes are exemplified in such sequences as Beth-shān, Scythopolis and the modern Beisān, or Accho ('Akkō), Ptolemais and 'Akkā. There has been uniformity, despite political and other changes; and although Egyptians, Hittites, Mitannians, Philistines, and other foreigners contributed effectively to the development of the land, their traces are not so clear as might have been anticipated; and the land succeeds in maintaining a certain autonomy and an individuality of its own (cf. vol. I, p. 192).

¹ Both 'Hittites' and 'Amorites' are terms which shifted somewhat in the course of time. The term 'Amorite' is applied quite generally in the O.T. to the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants, more specifically to those of the hill-country and of the mountains east of the Jordan. 'Canaanite' is used no less generally, or refers more specifically to the people of the coast-land. Certain biblical sources have a preference for the one or the other; but no entirely consistent usage can be recognized.

The widespread use of the Babylonian language and script among Semites, Hittites and others (pp. 332 *sqq.*), points to some earlier influence, which might naturally be associated with the history of the First Babylonian Dynasty and the empire of Hammurabi (c. 2100 B.C.; see vol. I, p. 493). But this period has also introduced us to a specific West Semitic or 'Amorite' culture, rather different from that of Babylonia itself; and consequently Amorites of Syria and Mesopotamia may have played a part similar to that of their successors, the Aramaeans, in spreading the *lingua franca* of the day (see vol. I, p. 230). In fact, the Amorites of the early Babylonian age correspond in some respects to the Aramaeans of the age of Assyria and Persia. But unfortunately there are many dark centuries, and we know too little of the cultural history of such important sites as Carchemish, Harran, Kadesh (on the Orontes), Hamath and Damascus, to speak with any confidence of the early conditions. The innumerable 'tells' of north Syria survive to indicate an early activity which was certainly not confined to those few ages upon which some light happens to be thrown. Recent studies on the old Semitic (? Assyrian, ? Amorite) colony in Cappadocia (p. 257 *sq.*) tend to show that here too may have been an important commercial centre of influence, like Damascus and Palmyra later. But how the familiar moon-god Sin appeared in 'Sinai'—where the name Horeb may also suggest the 'glowing heat' of the sun—and how such names as Jacob-el, Jacob-baal, Anath, Nebo, Dagan, Addu, and others, took root in Syria and Palestine, we do not at present know (vol. I, p. 233). The theory of some distinctive 'Amorite' culture and of its influence upon Syria and Palestine is attractive (cf. vol. I, p. 231), although Assyria is a political and civilizing factor not to be ignored.

When we descend to the fifteenth century B.C., Mitanni, the dominant state of the north, is carving out a great kingdom at the expense of Assyria; and, although we know little of what went before, later, at all events, Assyrian history is essentially one continuous effort to extend westwards and gain the coast-lands (pp. 239 *sqq.*). It is noteworthy that Adad-nirari of Nukhashshi has an Assyrian name (pp. 231, 310); and the characteristic combination of Shamash and Adad in the names of Assyrian kings of the period finds its counterpart in Syrian 'theology' of the Amarna age (p. 351). The old Assyrian royal name, Ishme-Dagan ('D. heard') may also be cited, in view of the occurrence of this divine name in Palestine (vol. I, p. 232), and apparently also in Cappadocia. When in course of time Mitannians and Hittites ceased to control the land we perceive sweeping ethnical changes

in the north, and towards the close of the thirteenth century minor Aramaean states ('houses,' *bitān*) make their appearance in the north-west and south-west of Mesopotamia. From time to time Assyria struck westwards—and Babylonia, once under Nebuchadrezzar (twelfth century B.C., p. 247)—but a dark period follows. Subsequently (ninth century) powerful kingdoms are found in north Syria, with connections reaching into Asia Minor and Palestine; the name Hatti is also found along the littoral. Assyria must repeatedly dash herself against these heirs of old Mitannian and Hittite domination, until opposition was at length worn down, and the subjugation of the petty kingdoms in the south became only a matter of time—their fall being the end of the monarchies, first of Israel, then of Judah. But, between these two great periods of northern empire (Hittite-Mitannian and Assyrian) there was an age of relative freedom for Syria and Palestine, and it is in the light of larger developments such as these that we may seek to understand the rise of Israel and her neighbours.

In Egypt the reign of Ramses III marks the decline of Egyptian power. The day of great conquering Pharaohs was over, and the priesthood, against which Ikhnaton had struck a heavy blow, was gaining immense wealth and authority (p. 182 *sq.*). The Delta freed itself, and Wenamon's report shows how the decay of Egypt was contemporary with the growing strength of Dor and Byblus (p. 191 *sq.*). The coast-towns had always been accessible to strangers from the Levant, and the epoch-making movements by land and by sea in which the 'Philistines' and others were involved had led to new settlements and had inaugurated new traditions. They presumably mark the beginning of the iron age in Syria (p. 292). The Syrian ports became the heirs of the sea-trade of Aegeans and Egyptians; and, while we need not accept Zakar-baal's picturesque allusion to the 10,000 ships at Sidon, belonging to one Berket-el (the name means 'the blessing of God')—apparently a Phoenician merchant resident in the Delta—the rise of Phoenicia as an independent maritime power may no doubt be dated in the twelfth (? or thirteenth) century after the far-reaching disturbances in the Levant. It is significant that the Greeks took into their vocabulary, not Semitic nautical terms, but terms referring to trade and commerce (*e.g.* ἀρραβών, βύσσος, κάμηλος, etc.). The expansion of Phoenicia, in fact, may not be due to the inadequacy of territory (*e.g.* pressure exerted by new tribes in Palestine), but rather to the new circumstances attending the downfall of the earlier great Mediterranean powers (cf. p. 280). There had been Cretan colonies in Egypt, and, to judge from the pottery,

perhaps also in Palestine (see pp. 293, 427). It is **Phoenicia** which now begins to establish trading-centres, if not colonies; and tradition enumerates among the oldest, Utica, Citium, Gades (Cadiz) and Lixus (Mauretania); cf. pp. 557, 581, 590. Again, it is only late tradition which dates the foundation of Tyre (really a very ancient city) in the year before the fall of Troy (c. 1184, vol. I, pp. 178 *sq.*), and after the foundation of Sidon, the Sidonians having been driven out by the king of Askalon. In many respects, therefore, the period in question is that of sweeping movements which are a landmark in ancient history, and this interconnection between Askalon and the north agrees with what recurs from time to time—'Phoenicians' holding southern ports or with colonies in the south (*e.g.* at Mareshah), and 'Philistines' occupying the maritime plain and, therefore, the important route that runs along the coast to Phoenicia. On Askalon, see also below, p. 547.

Like the Phoenicians, the Philistines appear before us as, in many respects, a Semitic people. The question of their origin and culture has been dealt with elsewhere (chap. XII); and, although much remains obscure, both the O.T. and the external evidence agree in recognizing the prominence of the Philistines in the twelfth century and after. Moreover, the presence of Carian mercenaries, centuries later, in the time of the kings of Judah indicates, what is only to be expected, that there was constant intercourse between the Syrian coast and Asia Minor. In the eighth century we shall find independent 'Philistine' kinglets of some importance. Accordingly, the history of the Philistines in the O.T. may perhaps be regarded as properly that of the mixed people of the coastal plain of Philistia¹. Indeed, the O.T. accounts of the Philistines frequently suggest a recollection of traditions referring to the later period. But the prominence of these people somewhere about 1150–1050 B.C. is a most valuable starting-point for the history of Israel, inasmuch as we may distinguish an Egypto-Hittite or pre-Philistine stage from that where the prominence and subsequent overthrow of these 'uncircumcised' aliens mark the rise of the Israelite monarchy.

Both Philistia and Phoenicia, then, may perhaps be preferably regarded as territorial names, the 'Phoenicians' being, strictly, the Semitic and other inhabitants of the sea-board from Mt Carmel to the Eleutherus, and, as such, always likely to be engaged in

¹ The name Philistia was subsequently extended (as was also that of Canaan), and was applied by the Greeks to the land as far as the Jordan and, later, even beyond. Cf. p. 295 and n. 1.

~~sea-trade~~. Hence, much of that which is regarded as 'Phoenician' is not necessarily 'Semitic.' The Jews of all ages have shown little predilection for the sea; and although some Israelite tribes (Asher, Dan, Zebulun) apparently adjoined the sea at some period, the kingdoms of both Judah and Israel were usually severed from the sea-ports by foreign territory. The Philistines are commonly associated with the five cities, Ekron, Gath, Ashdod, Askalon and Gaza. But at times they held sway over a larger area (including, *e.g.* Joppa); and the beautiful and rich plains of Sharon which, with Dor, lay between the Phoenician and Philistine cities would belong to the one or the other, save when Israel was able to control the coast. Dor (held by Solomon, 1 Kings iv, 11) was occupied by the Thekel (or Zakkal), allies of the Philistines (pp. 192, 285), and under king Badira, whose name may be Semitic (? Bad-el). The thoroughly un-Semitic place-name Ziklag, to the south of Palestine, may conceivably preserve some echo of the Zakkal (p. 291), and in the south we find the Cherethites whose name suggests the Cretans (p. 285). Lod (Lydda) itself may (as Hall thinks) be connected with the Cretan Lyttos. Our evidence is admittedly dubious, but at all events Philistines are also located at Gerar in the south of Palestine, perhaps near Gaza (Gen. xxvi, 1 compared with xx, 1, see also pp. 359, 392), and Gaza was the port for Crete and the Levant¹.

The importance of the Philistine area is self-evident. It united the maritime plain and its routes both with the old military road into Egypt and with the trade-routes from Gaza to Edom and Arabia. Gaza thus stood at the great cross-roads. It cannot be definitely stated that there was already in existence the old Arabian civilization of the Minaeans—whence a possible origin of the story of the founding of Gaza by (the Cretan) Minos (but see p. 288)—although relations between Babylonia and Egyptian—partly *via* this district—go back to a very early age (vol. 1, pp. 256, 262 *sq.*, 362). Certainly, in the time of the Israelite monarchy there seems to have been a south Arabian culture with which that of Israel had several points of contact, *e.g.* as regards ritual; and in view of the persisting relations, later, between Philistia and Edom, we may lay special emphasis upon the superior political importance

¹ It might be mentioned that not only has a connection been daringly found between the Hivites (Hivvi) and Girgashites of the O.T. and the Achaeans (p. 283) and Kalikisha (p. 281), but very sweeping theories of Levantine (Aegean, Greek, etc.) invasion and influence upon Palestinian ethnology are from time to time put forth, though upon rather precarious grounds. Some influence is of course to be expected (pp. 278, 303).

of the area at the southern end of Palestine between Gaza and the north of the Gulf of Akabah.

So long as the people of the maritime coast were independent, could exploit the fertility of the land, control the great trade-routes between Egypt and Damascus and between Arabia and the sea, and could both enjoy the fruits of commerce and hold the people of the interior, so long was an inland Israel subordinate to the Philistines and other aliens (cf. p. 291). 'When we stand on some eminence that commands this rich strip of territory, we find it easy to understand the bitterness with which through the centuries the Hebrews regarded the Philistines' (Macalister). With such a picture in our mind it becomes exceedingly significant that, according to early sources, two great belts of cities, connecting the maritime plain with the eastern routes, lay outside Israel's hands (*viz.* Megiddo, Taanach, etc., in the north; Gezer, Jerusalem, etc., in the south), and that when both Saul and David began to set up a monarchy all Israel was practically under alien domination (p. 371 *sq.*). The Amarna letters have already shown us how hostile control of the main routes would enfeeble the Palestinian chieftains who appeal to Egypt for aid; and it is noteworthy that even in Merneptah's inscription (p. 169), the Israel, who is distinguished from Askalon and Gezer (coast-land), Yenoam (? in the north) and Kharu (see p. 316), appears to represent a central Palestinian group of somewhat modest extent and authority. But the O.T. is our sole source.

V. ISRAEL, JUDAH AND KING SAUL

According to the O.T., the kingdom of Israel arose at some overthrow of Philistine supremacy; the more precise details of the prelude are doubtful. In the account of the anti-Egyptian disturbances in the Amarna letters, the *Sa.Gaz*, Habiru and Sutu are found scattered from Phoenicia and Syria southwards. Invading elements were doubtless involved, but those named are occasionally referred to as settled occupants of the land¹. There is no philological objection to the identification of the word Habiru with the name of the Hebrews; and the latter, according to the biblical genealogies, represent a group considerably larger than the Israelites. The Amarna letters do not prove that the Hebrews were then invading the land—much less the Israelites; but they do point to movements on sea and on land and to critical internal conflicts in which the Habiru ('Hebrews') are

¹ Ideograms for country are used (1) *ki*, in ccxv, ccxcviii (of the *Sa.Gaz*), and cclxxxix (the Habiru), and (2) *mātu* in cxxii and ccxcvii (the Sutu).

pre-eminently anti-Egyptian. Then, as later, there were conflicting policies, 'they call to Egypt, they go to Assyria' (Hosea vii, 11)—though now the Hittites are the northern alternative. The anti-Egyptian party permeated the whole country: it had its strength in the north, in Amor (Abd-Ashirta and Aziru); it found support in Hatti warriors, and in anti-Egyptian cliques in Mitanni; and it had won over some of the Egyptian officials themselves. On both sides the names are varyingly Semitic and non-Semitic; and while the Egyptian cause was bravely upheld in Jerusalem, Megiddo, Tyre and Byblus, and other cities, the opponents, as we have seen, gained a strong hold upon the main routes. Although this anti-Egyptian movement seems to be supported by some influential Semitic officials, it could hardly bring about the supremacy of any 'Hebrew' power: it is Hittite supremacy that colours the later history, and when both the Hittite and the Egyptian powers declined, there still remained the strength of their heirs, the minor northern states—*e.g.* Amor—and of the coast-land, before Israelites could be politically independent (see pp. 240, 318 *sq.*). The problem of the rise of Israel has yet to be solved.

When the Israelites entered Palestine we learn that they intermarried with the population, and adopted the native cults. The fact is of the utmost importance (Deut. xxxii, 16 *sq.*; Judg. iii, 5-7; Ps. cvi, 34 *sqq.*). The older native traditions and those brought by the immigrants would naturally undergo some fusion. Moreover, this would recur at every entrance of important elements from the desert, when the traditions of earlier and of recent movements would react on each other. Notwithstanding the indebtedness of Israel to the priest of Midian (Ex. xviii; Num. x, 29-32), Midianites were also dangerous and destructive raiders, although the story in Num. xxxi shows how Israel could be recruited through Midianite blood (*v.* 19). Although Israel was in some part composed of Edomite elements, there were times when Edom was an implacable foe. Israelite writers have even preserved a perfectly independent Edomite list which has proved to be of the highest value (*p.* 366 *sq.*). Israelites also settled in Moab; but Moab, too, was sometimes hostile. Nor were the Philistines always detested (see *p.* 392): recent investigations suggest that fusion with the Israelites has left a permanent impression in the form of a certain 'European' or 'pseudo-Gentile' type which, according to Dr R. N. Salaman, still persists among the Jews. Hence, as the biblical history extends over a long period, and as from time to time tribes or groups were entering from the desert and settling down, the most conflicting standpoints and perspectives could easily

persist, and find a place in our composite sources. Besides the standpoint of the settled people, certain passages give us the characteristic attitude of the desert-dwellers, their dread of the great walled cities, their antipathy to the civilization of the towns. Again, with the innocent stories of the 'high places' (e.g. 1 Sam. ix) we can contrast the darker scenes which merited the condemnation of the reformers. We have at times the standpoint of men who are cut off from the cities; we learn how the Philistine overlords hear, at the rise of Saul, 'the Hebrews have revolted' (so read in 1 Sam. xiii, 3). Only as we realize how often 'the people' played a prominent part in the biblical history can we adequately appreciate the fact that the history was compiled and shaped for popular edification. The aim was to explain, justify and teach; and the lesson is characteristically implied in the narratives and not made explicit. History is retributive; the chain of cause and effect is in terms of divine action. Characteristic, also, of the biblical narrative is the deliberate avoidance of mythological and other speculation such as we find in the surrounding civilizations, although, to judge from many hints, it was familiar in Palestine. We note how frequently we are given the popular explanation of the meaning and origin of names (Penuel, 'the face of God,' Gen. xxxii, 21-32; see the whole passage), the origin of ceremonies and festivals, of social and religious customs, and so forth. Of particular importance is the association of various sacred places with the patriarchal and other figures of Israelite history, even as the local 'saints' of the sacred tombs of to-day are often the 'orthodox' heirs of earlier 'heathen' prototypes. We also learn something of the history of the Ark of the Covenant, the Tabernacle, the Temple, the Priesthood, and especially the rise of the lengthy dynasty of Judah, with all its profound significance for later Messianic ideas. The foundation of the Israelite people, the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of Palestine culminate in the Davidic king and in Solomon's temple of Jerusalem; the reader is thus led on to the kingship and the Jerusalem priesthood.

Our sources, which are highly composite and complicated, also appear to reveal the traces of particular monarchical and priestly tendencies, such as meet us in full force centuries later, when these narratives were receiving their present shape. Bearing in mind the ordinary characteristics of tradition and of the method of compiling history, we have to realize that the names are often older and more authentic than what is actually said of them. We have each tradition or narrative as it was at some particular age, and in some particular form. Thus, there may well have been a

sanctuary at Jerusalem in the time of Abdi-Khiba; but the writers find the inauguration of *their* famous temple in the days of David and Solomon. Hence it is often necessary to go beneath our sources and ask, What is the writer intending to represent? What does his standpoint imply? and—only after that—is his representation trustworthy? We have often the popular or traditional representation of what may be authentic data, could we but recover them. Some echo of influential Semites in the Egyptian service (*e.g.* Yankhamu, Dudu, see p. 323) may have lingered in memory. No doubt some conspicuous historic event occurred at the 'Red Sea' to justify the rise of the inveterate tradition which so inspired Israel (*Ex. xiv sq.*). We may even entertain the suggestion that the marvellous overthrow of the walls of Jericho is to be associated with some landslide to which we may perhaps find an allusion in the disturbance of the Jordan (*Josh. iii, 16*). But this method of interpretation, adopted in all sincerity in order to substantiate the biblical narrative as completely as possible, has most obvious dangers; and cautious criticism, it is not out of place to add, may consist in determining, not how little we need depart from the biblical history, but what interpretation of all the material affords the best means of tracing the course of events, and also provides a reasonable explanation of what cannot be accepted as trustworthy as it stands.

Archaeological discoveries, it is necessary to remember, have neither 'proved' nor 'disproved' the O.T. record, but have placed it in an altogether new light. Thus, as regards Genesis and other books of the Pentateuch, it cannot be maintained that the conditions as therein represented necessarily testify to the *early* knowledge in Palestine (say, before the monarchy) of the ancient Babylonian Code of Hammurabi. The Code may certainly have been known in the west; but, as it embodies old customary usage which existed both before it and independently of it, it does not follow that a custom or law which agrees with the Code is necessarily based upon it, or belongs to this early period. For example, when Abraham expelled the mocking Hagar at the demand of his wife Sarah (*Gen. xvi, xxi*), his act, although in accordance with the Code, (*Sect. cxlvi*), does not prove that he knew the Code, or that the incident belonged to the age of Hammurabi (*cf. vol. 1, pp. 523 sq.*). The Code long continued to be known, and more recent discoveries of Assyrian and Hittite collections, differing in some important respects from the Babylonian—the Assyrian, for example, being in certain details relatively less developed as regards legal and ethical ideas—prove that the

parallels in the O.T. need not be referred back either to the Code of Hammurabi or to its age. Many interesting points of similarity with ancient Babylonian usage can be found much later in the Talmud; and there are many elements of belief and custom which, taken by themselves, afford no indication whatever of the date to which they belong. Palestine possessed some degree of culture from a very early date; but relatively 'primitive' or 'archaic' usages always persisted among simpler communities, and these, coming to the front at certain periods of upheaval (notably in the sixth century B.C.), are not, as such, necessarily earlier than those which strike us as 'advanced.' In the account of Abraham's purchase of the Cave of Machpelah (Gen. xxiii) there is nothing to enforce its antiquity; but there is much that tends to make the record part of the latest (and post-exilic) sources of the book. Similarly as regards isolated historical statements, such are the general topographical and other conditions that the same sort of event could recur at several different ages; intercourse with and knowledge of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia were not confined to any one age; and topographical and other considerations taken by themselves cannot prove the particular accuracy of a narrative which, on other grounds, is held either to be untrustworthy; or not to refer to the particular age which it purports to treat. A great deal of early history has been lost—e.g. the 'Amarna age' itself can scarcely be recognized—and we may contrast the historical completeness of the old story of Sinuhe (vol. I, p. 226) with the way in which the historical background has been 'washed out' of the narratives in Genesis.

It has already been stated that the account of Abraham's victory over Chedorlaomer and his allies (Gen. xiv) cannot be used for the history of his age (vol. I, p. 236). Even if Tidal, 'king of nations,' should prove to be the Hittite Dudkhalla (cf. p. 267), and the record refer to some event shortly before or after the Amarna age—in which case the date of Abraham must also be reduced—the internal difficulties of the chapter would still prevent our regarding it as a trustworthy historical source. What facts lie behind the perplexing reference to the supremacy of Cushan-rishathaim, king of Aram, over Israel, and his defeat by Caleb's brother Othniel, of Kenizzite or Edomite extraction (Judg. iii)? Some conflict between an Edomitic South Palestine and the Aramaeans of the north can be more easily conjectured than substantiated; and the king's remarkable name—as though 'Cushan (a Cushite?) of double-wickedness'—could suggest an echo of the Kassites of Babylonia, or of Tushratta of Mitanni:

and other conjectures have also been made. Shamgar, son of Anath, who, by his ox-goad delivered Israel from the Philistines (Judg. iii, 31; cf. the stories in xv, 15; 2 Sam. xxiii, 11 *sq.*), though among the saviours of Israel, has a foreign name which reminds us of that of Sangara, the Hittite king of Carchemish (eighth century, one of his allies was a Bur-Anati). But he is mentioned in the old poem, Judg. v, almost as a foreign oppressor, like the great Sisera himself. It is not unnatural that some king of north Syria might dispute a Philistine attempt to overcome Israel, and Israel's salvation would only mean a change of masters. Tradition has its own ways of preserving echoes of the past and of recording authentic history, and there is at least a certain appropriateness in the traditions of this unknown king of Aram, the obscure Shamgar, and finally the famous Sisera, whose name has Hittite connections. Possibly we have here the late echoes of a Hittite and early Philistine period.

'The Song of Deborah' (Judg. v), evidently the most ancient piece of Hebrew literature, is unfortunately very imperfect, and has probably been revised. It describes the disunion and oppressed state of the tribes of Israel, the absence of arms among the forty thousand of Israel (cf. the situation at the rise of Saul, 1 Sam. xiii), the unsettled conditions, the cessation of the caravans, and the difficulty of communications. Authority ceased; men had renounced their gods (? v. 7 *sq.*). The tribes were aroused by Deborah ('bee') and Barak ('lightning'); but there was no little apathy, and a city like Meroz is bitterly cursed for its treacherous failure to assist Israel in following up its victory. Such indifference and negligence are by no means rare (cf. Judg. viii, 5-9). The victory none the less was complete. The kings of Canaan under Sisera fought at Taanach, at the waters of Megiddo (the Kishon). Yahweh manifested his loyalty as a ruler over Israel (v. 11), and the stars in their heavenly courses (? stations) joined in the fight. The enemy was swept away in the storm, and Sisera, fleeing towards Kadesh in Naphtali, took refuge in the tent of a Kenite woman, who slew him as he was about to drink of the milk she offered him in response to his request (v. 26). It was an act of dubious morality which in the prose story becomes a downright breach of desert chivalry (iv, 19 *sq.*). A brief and vivid sketch of Sisera's mother with her princesses, eagerly awaiting the chieftain, concludes the poem; and, if it was composed by a woman (v. 7 is ambiguous in the original), we may notice the prominence of female characters in the book of Judges (cf. also Miriam's song, Ex. xv, 21).

The victory over Sisera and the Canaanites is ascribed to Barak (of north Palestine) and Deborah; and the flight of the army towards Harosheth of the Peoples (iv, 16) points to warfare in which Israel's enemy was probably the people of the coastland. (Judg. iv. may also contain references to another battle.) The important cities Dor, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo and Bethshean were not in the possession of Israel (Judg. i), and an enemy, thus holding the roads leading to the east of the Jordan, could prevent any effective alliance of those Israelite tribes which lay to the north and south. Hence, whatever Israel may have owed to the 'hornet' sent in advance to clear the way (Josh. xxiv, 12), the stimulus to this overthrow of Canaanites comes from Deborah, the 'bee'; and we are to suppose that the central and northern tribes were no longer separated. Judah, however, is not mentioned in the poem.

In the narrative that follows, an effort is made to establish a monarchy. Gideon, or Jerubbaal (perhaps originally two distinct heroes), was of Ophrah, which belonged to the clan of Abiezer of the tribe of Manasseh. The Midianites had overwhelmed the land as far south as Gaza; their head-quarters were in the famous valley of Jezreel, and Gideon, with the help of Manasseh and the northern tribes, cleansed the land. Ephraim, although participating, manifested a characteristic jealous independence. Called upon to be king of Israel, Gideon refused on the ground that Yahweh was king (Judg. viii, 23); it is the sentiment of the later version of the rise of Saul (1 Sam. viii, 7; x, 19; xii; see p. 354). According to the highly composite narrative, Gideon had begun as a courageous reformer, upholding Yahweh against Baal, the god of his father (note the sacred tree, Judg. vi, 11); and, when invited to reign over Israel, he sought to centralize religion and unify the people by setting up in his city a sacred object of cult. The writer, who views this as a snare and an offence, calls it an ephod, an object used for obtaining divine counsel; perhaps originally an actual image was set up.

But there were never lengthy dynasties in the north, and a story is introduced describing the sequel. It is connected with the ancient and famous city of Shechem, whose god was Baal-Berith, the god of covenants, and therefore an appropriate god for a city which lay near several important roads. At the sanctuary was a famous oak (cf. Gen. xxxiii, 20; xxxv, 4; Deut. xi, 30; Judg. ix, 6), and all the tribes of Israel here entered into a solemn covenant with Yahweh (Josh. xxiv). It was at Shechem, too, that Solomon's son Rehoboam must be crowned; and, when the mon-

archy was divided, Jeroboam made it the capital of the northern kingdom. Gideon had been regal enough to possess many wives and a large household; and on his death Abimelech, the son of a Shechemite concubine, gained the support of Shechem and the guardians of the sanctuary, and massacred all the princes. Jotham, the youngest, alone escaped, and in the well-known parable denounced the election of this low-born thorn-bush and proclaimed the fate of the choice cedars of Lebanon. In due course Abimelech was treacherously deserted, Gaal aroused the old Shechemite family of Hamor (for which see also Gen. xxxiv) and seized a number of cities, but was soon defeated. Abimelech, in turn, suffered a humiliating death at Thebez, about twelve miles north-east of Shechem. Thus was Jotham's curse fulfilled, although the author is too interested in the divine control of history to give us any further account of Shechem or of Jotham.

We now reach the period of the Philistine oppression (Judg. x). The introduction to the story of Jephthah, a Gileadite hero, refers to both Philistines and Ammonites; and his deliverance of Gilead—once more there is Ephraimite jealousy—thus associates him with Saul, who likewise was closely connected with Gilead. On the other hand, the stories of the Nazarite Samson, who 'began' to save Israel from the Philistines, are of a Danite hero of the clan of Manahath, of which his 'father' Manoa is the eponymous ancestor, and possibly, like Gideon, the reputed founder of a local cult (Judg. xiii should be compared with vi, 11-24). The stories of Samson ('solar') contain elements of solar-myth, and resemblances to the famous Babylonian myth of Gilgamesh. It is worth noticing that in the Amarna letters one Addu-dani (p. 314) is connected with the Danite district (*viz.* the cities Joppa, Gezer, Gath and Manahath). Dan may be an old name, and the story of the movement of Danite clans to north Palestine, to a district between Phoenicians and Aramaeans (Judg. xvii sq.; cf. above, p. 367), may perhaps belong to the same cycle as the later tradition of the movement which brought the 'Phoenicians' from the south (vol. 1, p. 234 sq.).

The fame of Saul has been almost eclipsed by that of Samuel and David; yet ancient national tradition must have had much to say of the first founder of the monarchy. Indeed, the account of the birth and consecration of *Samuel* is that of the child who had been *asked* (*shā'āl*); and this is precisely the meaning of Saul's name, and not of that of Samuel (1 Sam. i, 20, 27 sq.). If Samuel had gained a sweeping and final victory over the Philistines—or 'Amorites' (vii, 14)—who had occupied the land, there is no

room for Yahweh's selection of Saul to deliver the people groaning under their heel (ix, xiii sq.); whereas if we regard the latter as the earlier and more authentic tradition, the prelude can hardly be found, unless we go back to the story of Jephthah. The Philistines had practically disarmed the Israelites (cf. the conditions in Judg. v, 8), and apparently had iron weapons (Goliath, 1 Sam. xvii, 7). Saul's victory over them is, like that of Samuel, accompanied with striking manifestations of nature (vii, 10; xiv, 15), and in this and other respects the first founder of the monarchy finds interesting parallels in the Ephraimite Joshua, the traditional conqueror of Palestine (Josh. x, 11). This parallelism is significant.

When Saul built his first altar—the place is not named—the 'rolling' suggests the site of Gilgal, which enters prominently into his traditions (1 Sam. xi, 14 sq.; xiii, 8; xiv, 33–5), and into that of Joshua (v, 9). To the 'troubling' in reference to the broken tabu, which gave rise to the name of Achor (Josh. vii, 25 sq.), there is a parallel in the 'troubling' of the people by Saul, also in connection with a tabu (1 Sam. xiv, 29). There is, moreover, a general agreement in the fights between Israel and the southern enemy. Both Joshua and Saul enter into relations with Gibeon; and while Saul in his zeal for Yahweh sought to exterminate this remnant of the 'Amorites' (2 Sam. xxi, 2), Joshua, in a narrative, which on independent grounds seems to be later, delivered them from the sanguinary zeal of Israel (Josh. ix, 18, 26). To the coalition of Gibeonite and other cities belonged Beeroth, the home of Saul's captains, who, after the death of the father, killed his lame young son Ishbaal (2 Sam. iv, 5). It is an indication of the feeling between Saul and these southern aliens: David, on the other hand, appeased Gibeon by handing over to their vengeance seven members of Saul's family (xxi).

In all these fights against the land south of Ephraim the district called after Benjamin naturally had first to be won. Near Gilgal Yahweh sent his 'captain of the host' to encourage Joshua (Josh. v, 13–15; the account is incomplete); and hard by Bethel was the place where, according to a late version, Jacob first received the significant name Israel: 'El (God) contends' (Gen. xxxv, 10). The site between Bethel and Ai had some specially sacred associations in Israel's wars (Josh. viii). It was also the scene of the separation of Abram and Lot (the father of Moab and Ammon), a duplicate of which is that of Jacob-Israel and Esau-Edom (see p. 360). Some profound difference between central Palestine and the south was evidently connected with this locality, and it is noteworthy that, not only was there a Reubenite name in the

district (see p. 367), but the tradition goes on to mention the incest of Reuben with Bilhah (Gen. xxxv, 22; incomplete) as an explanation of the degradation of that once important tribe and the consequent supremacy of Judah, and the narrative forthwith enumerates the tribes of Israel and the Edomite subdivisions. What tribal and national developments lie behind these data can only be conjectured; but it is at this point that we hear of the death of Rachel (the 'mother' of the Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh), and the birth of Benjamin. Not only does tradition thus represent some significant political difference as we proceed south, but Benjamin is the youngest of all the tribes, and his original name, Ben-Oni, is one of other Benjamite names which, together with those of Judah, link the southern clans with those of Edom (cf. p. 366 *sq.*). Hence it would seem that south of the 'Joseph' tribes was a great Edomite-Reubenite-Judaeen *bloc*. Now, Rachel's grave is variously placed north of Jerusalem, near Bethel (Jer. xxxi, 15; 1 Sam. x, 2), or south of it, at Bethlehem (Gen. xxxv, 19; a gloss). The meaning of the difference is self-evident in that, according to the latter view, Jerusalem is included within the district associated with Rachel (cf. the name Ephrath at Bethlehem, p. 374), whereas, according to the former, Jerusalem would lie within the district associated with the population which was alien to the north.

The position of the debatable district of the tribe of Benjamin is ambiguous. Tradition perhaps regarded Saul as the creator of Benjamin—the late story in Judg. xix–xxi practically wipes out the old tribe and builds up a new one with the help of Shiloh (near Shechem) and Jabesh-Gilead. But the connection of the Benjamite district with Judah is close, and the indications of some essential difference between central Palestine (Ephraim) and its southern neighbours are too persistent to be ignored. Edom and Seir, on the other hand, are old terms, and even the Amarna letters seem to represent a political area stretching southwards, perhaps as far as Seir (p. 317). Similarly, much later, Gibeon, Gaza, Kadesh and Goshen form a single district (Josh. x, 41; p. 353). Accordingly, when the Song of Deborah ignores Judah, we may infer, not that there was no Judah, but that the district so-called lay outside the political horizon of the central and northern tribes. It is from these tribes that the oldest literary material, as a whole, appears to proceed, and the stories typically emphasize the extreme importance of the valley of Jezreel, the prominence of its towns (for Megiddo see already, p. 68), and its accessibility to travellers and raiders from the east (cf. Midian,

Judg. vi, 33), or west (Canaanites, Judg. v; Philistines, 1 Sam. xxviii).

Saul, after a reign of which later Judæan prejudice has preserved but little that is trustworthy, was overwhelmed by the Philistines at Mt Gilboa. The fact that the enemy appear so far north, and that Saul's body was taken to Beth-shean, suggests that, not the Philistine pentapolis alone, but the whole coast-land itself was united against this attempt of the tribes of the interior to form a monarchy. In so far as Saul had held the two great salients running out from the coast-land towards Jerusalem and Beth-shean (p. 381)—and the narratives represent free intercourse between southern and central Palestine—he had taken the necessary steps to weaken the Philistines and other peoples of the coast-land, and to secure the complete independence of Israel. The loss of the line running to Beth-shean split up Israel. Saul, like some other great kings of the north, left a weak successor, and his son is found ruling Israel from beyond the Jordan, with the help of his general Abner. That Abner should attempt to strike out for himself is intelligible (2 Sam. ii); and we may observe that in later times such famous kings as Omri and Jehu were originally military leaders. But he had to reckon with David, and when we turn to the traditions of David the difficulty of reconciling the various accounts of this age becomes insuperable.

To Saul, the founder of the Israelite monarchy, are ascribed victories over the Aramaeans of Zobah in the north (cf. p. 310), over Moab, and over the Philistines, Amalekites and Edomites of the south (1 Sam. xiv). Originally, he was probably not of Benjamin, but perhaps rather of Gilead. His opponents have dealt unkindly with his memory, but what was said of the famous ancestor Jacob is in some respects reminiscent of the great military leader Joshua, and Joshua in turn is reminiscent partly of this founder of the monarchy¹.

¹ Joshua's law-giving and covenant at Shechem (Josh. xxiv, 22 *sqq.*), famous for its covenant-god (Judg. ix), as also the ceremony on Mt Gerizim (so read in Joshua viii, 30; p. 370), the covenant in the land of Moab (Deut. xxix, 1) and the law-giving at Kadesh, the 'well of judgement' (Gen. xiv, 7; Ex. xv, 25), are all now subordinated to the Mosaic law-giving at Sinai-Horeb. As for Saul, as the first king of Israel he would have been no less a religious founder than Jeroboam (p. 363), but we are told only of his *first* altar (1 Sam. xiv, 35). The story implies that he was a religious zealot (*vv.* 36 *sqq.*; cf. also xxviii, 9).

VI. DAVID AND SOLOMON

David, too, does not seem, in the older traditions at least, to belong to Bethlehem of Judah. Indeed, several lines of evidence have suggested to some scholars that he was the creator of Judah, and his home has been sought in south Palestine. Few old traditions from Judah have been preserved, although the district had ostensibly been taken by Joshua and held by both Samuel and Saul. But while Israelite traditions knew of an alien southern neighbour that must be conquered, Judaeans express the characteristic tendency of the south to expand northwards. When David is associated with Ziklag, Hebron and Gath, and works northwards, we can distinguish (a) a vassal of the Philistine Achish of Gath whose steps are likely to be resented by a Saul who has interests in Judah (1 Sam. xxvii, 12); and (b) a movement against giants—'Philistines'—a strange population, viewed from the primitive standpoint of the desert-dweller (cf. pp. 367, 373 *sq.*). But David does not have to conquer 'Philistines' in the north. In the former case he is a figure whose behaviour in the south of Judah will alienate Israel, and there is a compact (north) Israel to be won. Here north and south are evidently already distinct units, which had been united under Saul, and were to be reunited under David, whose first capital is Hebron in south Judah.

The founder of the Judaeans dynasty is a vassal of Achish, king of Gath (1 Sam. xxvii; for the name see p. 287). But the title of Ps. xxxiv calls the latter Abimelech, which is also the name of the 'Philistine' with whom Abraham made a covenant at Beer-sheba (Gen. xxi), while in a duplicate tradition it is Isaac who became powerful and entered into covenant-relations with Abimelech and the Philistines at Gerar (xxvi, see p. 359). If one tradition associates the rise of the Judaeans dynasty with a friendly Philistia—and David had a body-guard of Cherethites and Pelethites (see p. 285)—certainly an unfriendly one was always a danger: the situation so far is thoroughly intelligible. When the first king of Judah is even associated with the wilderness of Paran in the south (1 Sam. xxv, 1; the Septuagint reads Maon, to conform with the narrative that follows), he finds an interesting parallel in the Edomite prince Hadad, who took refuge in Egypt, married the Pharaoh's sister-in-law, became a serious antagonist of Solomon, and is associated with Midian and Paran (1 Kings xi). David also reminds us of Jeroboam, who for his hostility to Solomon must flee into Egypt, and whom the Septuagint tradition confused with

Hadad. Throughout, the political importance of the far south of Palestine and its Egyptian connections is strikingly manifest; and many centuries later the rise of the Idumaeen Antipater affords the crowning example of the way in which this region could reshape the history of Jerusalem.

Further light may be thrown upon the traditions of this age by an independent source (Gen. xxxvi), which reflects extensive Edomite interrelations east and west of south Palestine. In a list of kings who are said to have reigned before there was any king over Israel, the fourth is Hadad, who smote the Midianites in Moab. The event is sometimes conjecturally associated with Gideon's defeat of Midian: Edom and (north) Israel may, on this occasion, have been fighting a common enemy (cf *l'ac̄ar*, 2 Kings iii). The fact that the first king is Bela', son of Beor (? compare Bil'am, *i.e.* Balaam, p. 366), is then held to be a chronological confirmation. The fifth and sixth kings, Samlah and Shaul, are unknown; while of the last two, Baal-hanan and Hadar (or rather Hadad), the latter is presumably Solomon's adversary, and Baal-hanan, might be no other than David himself (Sayce). We learn incidentally that the slayer of Goliath was Elhanan, the son of Dodo of Bethlehem (2 Sam. xxi, 19; xxiii, 24); and as Solomon was otherwise called Jedidiah (2 Sam. xii, 25), so David may have been known as El-hanan, or the equivalent Baal-hanan. If so, he may appear in the Edomite list as an Edomite who also became king of Judah, or as a Judaeen or Israelite conqueror of Edom (2 Sam. viii, 14). In the latter case it is at least a coincidence that, of Baal-hanan's two predecessors, the second bears precisely the same name as Saul, to whom is actually ascribed the conquest of Edom (1 Sam. xiv, 47)¹. The assumption of a Judaeen-Edomite *bloc* extending to the southern border of Ephraim is strengthened by the traditions representing the 'Ephraimite' point of view noticed above, p. 390.

From the entirely conjectural identification of Baal-hanan, El-hanan and David (Sayce), we pass to the possibility (raised by Frazer) that 'David' was the name assumed by the heroic leader only after the capture of Jerusalem—was it, perhaps, the name of the city-god, with whom the new king identified himself?²

¹ The earlier, Samlah, is unknown, but forms of the name have south Palestinian and Judaeen connections, and one is even associated with Bethlehem. But it might conceivably be an error for Samuel.

² See Sir J. G. Frazer, *Adonis*, 2nd edn. p. 15 n., 3rd edn. vol. 1, p. 19 n.; Sayce, *Modern Review*, Jan. 1884, pp. 155 sqq. *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, pp. 53 sqq.

The view is an extremely interesting one, and deserves attention, since the ancient conception of the divine kingship was known in early Palestine (see pp. 345 *sqq.*). At all events, David places on his head the crown of Milcom ('king'), the national god of Ammon. Hence, while Solomon honoured both that god and Chemosh of Moab (1 Kings xi, 7), to David, who already had close relations with Moab, is thus ascribed an act symbolizing some relationship, if not a virtual identification, with the god of the conquered land of Ammon (2 Sam. xii, 30)¹. Solomon has important priestly functions, and David plays a prominent part in religious ceremonial, dances before the Ark, and blesses the people (2 Sam. vi); his sons even served as priests—though a later writer endeavoured to soften the statement (1 Chron. xviii, 17). As the 'light of Israel' (2 Sam. xxi, 17) he embodies the people's welfare (cf. the 'coal' in xiv, 7, and see 2 Kings viii, 19).

Moreover, the name David itself comes to have some significant uses. In the 'throne of David' and 'city of David' there is more than a reference to the historic founder of the monarchy of Judah. 'David' also connotes 'Davidic' (cf. Hōs. iii, 5); it is a dynastic name, even as Isaac, Jacob and Joseph are tribal or territorial names (Amos iii, 13; v, 6; vii, 16). The ideas of the Davidic hope and of the Messiah, the 'Anointed,' point to a theory of sovereignty which reminds us of the Egyptian ideas of the divine origin and authority of the Pharaoh. Even to a late date the royal throne at Jerusalem was the throne of Yahweh, upon which sat his king (1 Chron. xxix, 23; 2 Chron. ix, 8). Further, it is at least a coincidence that in the inscription of Mesha, king of Moab (c. 850 B.C.), not only is there the first mention, outside the O.T., of the divine name Yahweh, but Mesha states that he carried off from Ataroth the *Arel of Daudoh* (true pronunciation of each is uncertain), an object which we may compare with the Ariel of David's Jerusalem in Is. xxix, 1 *sq.* This object, apparently the *genius* of the city, the heart of its religious-political existence, is the forerunner of the Tyché or Fortune. The name David itself (cf. also Dodo, Dodaviah, Dido, etc.) seems to mean 'loved one.' The word *dōd* is also used of a kinsman (father's brother), and there is much in favour of the view that, as the name of a god, it denotes the local tutelary deity, or protecting god, and that the prophet Amos actually refers to the oath by the *dōd* of Beer-sheba².

¹ See R. V. mg. Cf. the symbolical representation of the union of Upper and Lower Egypt, vol. I, p. 266.

² In Amos viii, 14 for *d-r-k* (R. V. 'the way...') H. Winckler suggested

In the nature of the case we can hardly determine whether Dōd (or the like) was an old name of the god of Jerusalem, or was brought there by the first king. On the other hand, the sacred Ark, according to one tradition, had been borne by David's own priest, Abiathar, of the house of Eli (1 Kings ii, 26). His name (*Ebyāthār*) is closely related to that of Yether (Jethro), the father-in-law of Moses, and it is possible that there was some account of the journey of this sacred object into Judah from the south, entirely independent of the account of the fortunes of the Ark under Joshua—traces of this journey have already been pointed out (pp. 365, 367). There are, at least, conflicting statements of its history; and there is a distinct tendency both to ignore the debt to the kin of Moses (p. 362), and also to condemn the house of Eli, and proclaim a new and faithful priesthood, namely, that of Zadok (p. 371). Indeed, Solomon, it is said, degraded Abiathar and gave the first place to Zadok, who is essentially the representative of the Jerusalem priesthood. Late genealogical and other lists raise the Jerusalem priests and the Aaronites above those who are associated with Moses and the house of Eli. There was, however, some compromise and it seems probable that in the account of the fortunes of the priests of David and Solomon (Abiathar and Zadok), at the beginning of the monarchy, there is some reflection of later rivalries which were far more than merely ecclesiastical disputes. We tread upon difficult and obscure ground. The institution of the kingship was regarded in some circles as an offence; it was a slur upon the unique sovereignty of the God of Israel. It also affected the position of the priesthood. The Davidic hope, the Messianic idea itself, so far as it was one of human kingship, was not acceptable to all minds, and there is a striking difference between the regal and warring David, and the temple-patron Solomon, as 'peaceful' as his name itself implies (cf. especially 1 Chron. xxii, 9)¹.

With Solomon begins the history of the Temple and the supremacy of the Jerusalem priest Zadok. The Book of Kings,

d-d-k (*dōdāka*, thy *dōd*); the Greek version itself renders, 'thy god.' It may be added, as thoroughly typical of the complexity of our problems, that David's blond beauty (1 Sam. xvi, 12) has been explained (1) as suggestive of kinship with Philistines or Greeks (see p. 382, foot), or (2) as a Tam-muz-motif.

¹ The relation between the Davidic and Messianic ideas, on the one side, and the Solomonic ideas ('wisdom,' and erotic mysticism), on the other, does not of course come under consideration at this early period.

as a whole, takes us away from the foundation of temporal power to the history of the Temple of Jerusalem. David's wars, we are to understand, had prevented him from building the Temple, his hands were stained with blood (1 Kings v, 3; 1 Chron. xxii, 8; xxviii, 3); it is perhaps for this reason that the account of the purchase of ground from Araunah is placed where it is (2 Sam. xxiv), apparently at the close of his reign. On the other hand, we learn that Yahweh does not need a house, it is David's 'house' (dynasty) that will be built (2 Sam. vii); only by way of compromise do late writers in 1 Chronicles enlarge upon David's very elaborate preparations for the Temple. Solomon, we are further told, built or fortified such important cities as Megiddo and Beth-horon. His Egyptian father-in-law cleared Gezer of Canaanites, and gave the city to his daughter; only in this reign was the land cleansed of the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants. Egypt, it would appear, still laid claim to the southern coast-land, and Solomon's powerful alliance would keep Philistia quiescent. Solomon also made a covenant with Tyre, and with Tyrian help built the Temple. The Tyrian artificer, Hiram, whom he employed, was of the tribe of Dan; and it is noteworthy that Oholiab, whom tradition made a famous craftsman in the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, was also a Danite (Ex. xxxi, 6; 2 Chron. ii, 14), whose very distinctive name has parallels in both old Arabian and Phoenician inscriptions. The tradition of an important movement of Danites from South Palestine as far as Phoenicia, seems to have been a persistent one (see pp. 314, 388); and Danites, if we may rely upon Judg. v, 17, may even have taken part in Phoenician trading-journeys. Later in the history we find a determined effort to spread Tyrian religion in Palestine (ninth century, Ahab and Jezebel), and, according to Amos (eighth century) there had been 'brotherhood' between Israel and Tyre, until Tyre was guilty of unforgivable treachery (Amos i, 9).

Relations with Tyre go back to an early date, and it is a striking fact that in the Amarna letters Abimilki of Tyre calls his city the 'city of Shalmiati.' This recalls the names of Solomon (Heb. *Shālōmōh*) and Jerusalem (Uru-salim in Amarna letters). The latter presumably means 'foundation of Shalem'; and since a god Shalman (associated with Resheph) is known, it has been thought on various grounds that the city bears the name of an ancient deity, probably a Sun-god. Abimilki refers to Tyre either as the city of the Egyptian Pharaoh—his divine suzerain (cf. p. 341)—or as that of Shalmiati; and as the latter name is not treated by the scribe as that of a deity, we seem to have a personal link

as in the name of the 'city of David.' The name of Solomon himself seems to connect him with the city whose Temple he built, whereas his alternative name Jedidiah (2 Sam. xii, 25, the 'beloved of Yahweh') associates him with David ('beloved'). The true interpretation of such details as these is uncertain, but it will be noticed that the accounts of Solomon, the Egyptian and Phoenician alliances, the consolidation of the kingdom and the inauguration of the Temple and priesthood—not to mention the famous story of the visit of the Queen of Sheba—combine to present a picture very different from that of the warrior David, whose chief sanctuary was presumably at Gibeon, half-a-dozen miles north-west of Jerusalem (1 Kings iii, 4). Indeed, the history of Saul, David and Solomon holds so commanding a place in the scheme of biblical history, and the different records so seem to link together the centuries in which these great figures are placed, that it requires an effort to recognize that the old historians, while conscious of the significance of the age, had at their command only incomplete material and incompatible traditions.

VII. SOME CONTEMPORARY IDEAS

The names of David and Solomon are significant. That of Zadok himself, too, throws light upon early ideas. Although Zadok (*Ṣādōk*, 'righteous') is placed at the head of the temple-priesthood in the time of Solomon, his name has older associations. Adoni-zedek ('the lord is righteous'), king of Jerusalem, was conquered by Joshua (x, 1) and Jeho-zadak ('Yahweh is r.') was high-priest in the sixth century. Tradition also spoke of Abraham's contemporary, Melchizedek ('the [or my] king is r.') of Shalem, priest of God Most High (El 'Elyōn, Gen. xiv, 18). This divine title itself is ancient: the 'supreme god' of Hammurabi was Anu, the god of heaven—the feminine Anath is well-known (p. 347); and long afterwards the Phoenicians still knew of an 'Elyon called Most High.' The mysterious figure of the priest-king appears to be that of 'a traditional figure of great antiquity on whom the monarchy and hierarchy of Jerusalem based their dynastic and priestly rights' (Skinner). The author of Hebrews vii, 1 *sqq.*, speaks of him as an eternal priest, like unto the Son of God. We may doubtless recognize the conception of a type of which the priest-king (later the high-priest) was supposed to be an incarnation. We may compare the 'Davidic' idea above (p. 394), but should note that Zadok belongs to Solomon rather

than to David. The evidence, in spite of its lateness, agrees with ancient thought. It may be no mere chance, therefore, that, according to Isaiah (i, 26, eighth century), Jerusalem, the purged city, was to be as in olden time the 'city of righteousness,' and that Jerusalem is also styled by Jeremiah a 'homestead of righteousness' (Jer. xxxi, 23; l, 7).

The persistent association of 'righteousness' with Jerusalem is of the greatest interest. A derivative of the root occurs in the Amarna letters once (cclxxxvii, 32), when Abdi-Khiba of Jerusalem protests that he is 'in the right' (p. 343). It is used in the O.T. of just weights, of legal and social rights and duties, of social obligations, of conformity to truth and right¹. Thus, Yahweh is true to his character, or to his covenant with man; and, as in the old 'Song of Deborah,' manifests his 'righteous acts' by delivering his people from the foe. As applied to both gods and men it is capable of profound ethical and spiritual development. The word has certainly a common legal meaning; but right is judged by customary usage, and, conversely, the word for judgment (*mishpāṭ*) is used of a rightful due, a custom or customary act.

The fundamental meaning seems to be what is due or just, what should be; and men have certain convictions, not only of the proper behaviour among men, and of men towards the gods, but even of the gods towards men. The root is used in Arabic of what is congruent, of what conforms to its proper nature, and also of logical truth. Derivatives denote the next-of-kin (Nabataean), relatives (Syriac), and a special female friend, and a gift for her favours (Arabic). The underlying idea, on the whole, appears to be that of what is due and right *among the kin-group*—the group, not only of men, but of men *and* gods, for in old Semitic thought, as Robertson Smith was the first to elucidate, gods and men formed a single natural community. Our words 'kin' and 'kind' are suggestive, provided it be remembered that the old Hebrew term, which we render 'righteous' ('just,' 'due,' and the like), had a very much wider and far less specialized application. A late Phoenician myth mentions the two gods Misōr ('uprightness') and Suduk, and ascribes to them the discovery of the use of salt—very appropriately, inasmuch as bonds of friendship and piety were created by the use of salt in meals (note the 'covenant of salt,' Num. xviii, 19). Apart from the question whether there was also a god Šedek at Jerusalem, then, it may be concluded that

¹ In Is. xlv, 8, *šedek* and *šedakah* refer respectively to universal order (of heavenly origin) and social righteousness (displayed by man).

this persistent association of the idea of 'right' with the city carried with it ideas, beliefs and practices which were capable of profound development.

It is, further, a fact of no less significance that in the time of the Egyptian king Ikhnaton, special emphasis was laid upon ideas of truth, right, righteousness and justice (p. 120). One word is used, the precise *nuance* of which—like that of the Hebrew 'right'—depended throughout upon the particular context. Maat, the goddess of truth, was the impersonation of fixed law, divine and moral; she was wife of Thoth, the creator of civilization, and daughter of Re, the sun-god. Ikhnaton called his new city the 'city of truth' (cf. the name of Jerusalem in Isaiah i, above); and the Sun-god, everywhere a god of justice and righteousness, as the centre of his monistic and universalizing religion (p. 205 sq.). It is probable that he built a temple to his god Aton in Syria; and some authorities point to Khinnatun, on the border of Zebulun, near Accho, and situated upon an important trade-route (see p. 313), and interpret the name to mean 'glory of the Sun-disk (Aton).' However this may be, there were close relations between Egypt and Jerusalem, and Abdi-Khiba emphasizes his own claims, he was the king's shepherd, and his *ú-i-ú* (see p. 321, n. 1), and the claims of the city—the king had set his name upon it. To judge from letters from Byblus, Tyre and elsewhere, other writers could perhaps have made similar claims. No doubt all Palestine and Syria would know something, at least, of Ikhnaton's religion. His ideas would not, in any case, have been quite strange to Syria, accustomed as it already was to Sun-gods and divine kings. The fine symbol of the Sun-disk with its rays terminating each in a hand (p. 111 sq.) conveyed an idea that would be perfectly intelligible, and would give reality to familiar metaphors of the divine hand, whether upon man, or extended for man's help. Various features in Ikhnaton's conception of the universal and comprehensive beneficence of the Sun would be new, but the filial relation between king and gods would be no novelty. When Ikhnaton worshipped, as his father, not the visible material sun, but the sun as a life-giving power, Aton was regarded, like a Baal, as producer, cause, functionary or genius. But there was the same easy possibility of confusion between the effective power and its visible manifestation that there was between a god and its embodiment, as, for example, between the El and the Beth-el (cf. Gen. xxviii, 22).

In Egypt, both the Hyksos and an obscure Syrian upstart (p. 171 sq.) were iconoclastic, and Ikhnaton's reform itself has also

sometimes been ascribed to Asiatic influence. At all events, the royal house of Mitanni was related by marriage to the Egyptian dynasty; and, to judge from the name of Abdi-Khiba ('servant of the goddess Khiba'), Mitannian influence also reached Jerusalem (p. 332). Among the Mitannians are found names compounded with *Arta*, which appears to be a post-Aryan or pre-Iranian form of the later Persian Asha (cf. the later name Artaxerxes), and corresponds to the old Indian *Rita* (cf. p. 331). *Rita* is 'order' in its most general or undifferentiated sense: moral, social and ritual; moral rule, cosmic law, and the 'nature' of things. *Rita* made things what they were—true to type. In the old Aryan religion it was under the guardianship of Varuna, a god of markedly ethical character, who was lord of gods, the upholder of the moral law and the source of *rita*. Varuna finds a later parallel in the ethical Ahura-Mazda of Zoroastrianism, whose influence upon Palestine will be considered in its proper place. But besides the presence of the Arta-names, the astonishing fact, which we owe to the Boghaz Keui tablets, is the occurrence, in the Mitanni version of the treaty between Mattiuaza and Shubbiluliuma of Hatti (p. 262), among the various gods (including those of the *Sa.Gaz*), of 'the gods Mitrassil,' 'the gods Arunassil' (or Ur[u]vanassil), 'the god Indara,' and 'the gods Nashatianna'.¹ Here are to be recognized Mitra, Varuna, Indra and the Twins (Nāsatya, the husbands of the daughter of the Sun). All of them were gods evidently prominent and relevant enough to be included amongst those who witness and safeguard the treaty. Indeed, Mitra (the later Mithra) was 'friend' and personification of friendship and guardian of treaties, a moral god and closely associated with Varuna, who also watched over oaths, ordeals and treaty obligations. Both were guardians of royalty and of law.

In this far-reaching prominence of ideas of order, right and law—with which may be compared the Greek Dike and Themis—there is nothing wholly new. Long before, Hammurabi had received his Code from the Sun-god Shamash, and Shamash was the 'father' of Right (*Kittu*) and Uprightness (*Mēsharu*). Wherever gods and men were thought of as closely interrelated members of a community, tribe or state, there were necessarily ideas of what was right and just, though no doubt they were still rudimentary. But behind the essential points of resemblance among the old

¹ Cf. above, vol. I, pp. 237, 312; and for the plural 'gods'—like the Hebrew Elohim (a plural of majesty, amplification and intensification), see pp. 341 n, 350. If Abdi-Khiba's name may be read Arta-Khiba (see Burney, *Judges*, p. lxxxvi n.), it would correspond to the Hebrew name Zedek-iah.

religions, there are characteristic, and no less essential, differences which, it is very important to notice, can already be recognized. Although the Indian god Varuna in his ethical aspects more closely resembles the Israelite Yahweh than does any other contemporary god, Hebrew thought, in developing the moral and spiritual aspects of the relation between man and his god, takes a line characteristically different from the later separation of Varuna and the impersonal *rita*. In India Varuna came to be subordinated to the national god, Indra, a warrior and a storm-god of the Teshub-Addu-Baal type (see p. 348 *sq.*). This type was familiar in Palestine, and, accordingly, we find later that, while in India Varuna suffers a decline, the prophets of Israel contend for Yahweh against Baal, and uphold the moral character of Yahweh against ideas associated both with the Addu-type and with neighbouring religions. This characterizes the history of Israel. Moreover, while the impersonal *rita*, as a quasi-physical or rational principle, differs markedly from the later ethical Persian Asha, the ideal and genius of justice and equity, there is a certain sympathy between Semitic and Persian ethical tendencies, which, although especially significant in the Persian age, may well go back to the age of Hatti and Mitannian predominance¹.

Love of order, the idea of a rational universe, and aversion from an emotional mysticism characterize the Greek rather than the Semite (cf. p. 604 *sq.*). When *rita* was removed from the guardianship of Varuna the idea of order could develop apart from religious ideas; the way lay open for the beginnings, notably in western Asia Minor itself, of 'natural science' (cf. p. 550 *sq.*). Similarly, Ikhnaton's love of truth and nature, most conspicuous in the Amarna art (pp. 121, 411), his recognition of a single cosmic principle, and the absence of any emphasis upon purely ethical or spiritual values, might perhaps have led in the same direction. But in Egypt there was no further development, and in Asia Minor we have a period of disintegration. Only in Palestine do we find any real progressive movement. The Semitic mind, however, had no clear conception of order or of nature.

¹ At the present stage of knowledge it is possible only to observe that it is uncertain whether the god Varuna—the forerunner of Ahura-Mazda—is really Indo-European, and that the wave of ethical reform (cf. p. 403, n. 1) which introduced him and put him at the beginning of the history of Indo-Iranian religion lies outside history. It is of interest to notice that an appreciation of personality and a sense of truth have been remarked in the Hatti texts as a whole. For the present, Hatti and Mitanni seem to hold all the keys.

Things are in the care of God, or of powers, departmental or functional, local or national; and although the powers are thought of as personal, ideas of personality are fluid and unstable. The world could not be severed from the gods or God, and the gods are apt to be somewhat arbitrary. But, as we have seen, the world was not left to these powers alone; there are special individuals distinguished by their office, or their sanctity, or for other reasons, and these can directly or indirectly influence the natural and supernatural realms (cf. vol. 1, p. 211). Hence we can understand, not only the early pre-eminence of divine-kings, or priests, or prophets, or other sacred individuals, but also their ability to mould current ideas of right and wrong, and of good and evil. The ambiguous Egyptian term *hike*, which is variously 'religion' or 'magic'—according to our modern estimate of the true meaning of every reference—is thoroughly typical of the undeveloped character of early ideas (pp. 199, 202). The 'holy' men, like the 'holy' goddess Kadesh herself, were not necessarily of elevated moral character—they might be quite the contrary (see vol. 1, pp. 199, 209, 354 *sq.*). The ideas of what was 'right' and 'just' varied with the particular standpoint of the tribe, people or reformer. They represented the thought of the time: the 'laws of uprightness,' which Hammurabi vaunts, afford an excellent illustration (see vol. 1, pp. 516 *sqq.*). Personality, rather than principle, is the chief factor in Semitic history (cf. vol. 1, pp. 195, 212); and a Moses fittingly stands at the head of the religious history of Israel.

If the name Jerusalem suggests the idea of wholeness and peace (Heb. *shālôm*), the root also denotes recompense or requital; and, whether or not there was a god Shalem, god of reward or retribution—and the prominence of the idea of 'righteousness' suggests that there was—the 'Psalms of Vengeance' alone serve to indicate what, even at a more advanced age, men could expect from their own deities (cf. Ps. lviii, 10). If, too, David's name is that of a 'loving' protecting deity, especially associated with Jerusalem, there is a sexual use of the root (cf. *dūdā'im*), and the O.T. testifies to the persistent licentious cults in connection with the local Baals, the causes of the increase of life and growth (also at Jerusalem, see 1 Kings xv, 12 *sq.*; 2 Kings xxiii, 7). If the Egyptian king killed captives that his name might 'live for ever,' the sacrificial ideas of the Semite involved the conviction that supernatural powers must be sustained or nourished, and human sacrifice was all too common among the western Semites. Later, we shall find in and around Jerusalem itself signs of gloomy cults, doubtless of ancient origin. The early prominence of goddesses

of the Astarte type testifies to the prevalence of some of the more unrestrained sides of the early religion, and the utterances of the prophets themselves warn us that in olden times there were religious injunctions that were not good, and that men ascribed to Yahweh demands that had never entered his head (Ez. xx, 25; Jer. vii, 31; xix, 5).

In a word, we must not be misled by the early occurrence of concepts or ideas ('sacred, righteous,' etc.) to which we commonly tend to attach only some distinctively ethical or spiritual significance. Nor must we belittle the stage of religious development in Palestine. While, on the one hand, the biblical narratives do not permit us with any confidence to describe either the religion of Moses—although we can recognize some outstanding religious genius—or the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites—although some important movements can certainly be perceived—on the other hand, the study of the general conditions in Palestine itself is the more practicable enquiry¹. In Palestine religion was barbaric but capable of development; there were possibilities of ethical advance, and of deterioration, and the need of some new religious revival. The 'Amarna' age was international (cf. the Greek 'heroic' age, p. 485), and there were tendencies towards the recognition of supreme gods. Later, also, we find Tukulti-Ninurta and other Assyrian kings calling themselves 'Sun of all peoples,' an indication of monarchical monotheism. Ikhnaton himself is a land-mark in ancient history. As king-priest and son of the universal Sun-god, Aton, he withstood the Theban priesthood; he is an early example of a priestly king in antagonism to the hierarchy. The priesthood won the day; but in the gradual weakening of national religion personal religion became deeper (p. 160 sq.). The close interrelations between Egypt and Syria under the earlier Ramessids may allow the surmise that Syria did not remain untouched by Ikhnaton's democratic symbolism and subsequent religious vicissitudes of Egypt. Baal, it is true, became more prominent in Egypt, and the god has a distinctly warlike and harsh character (p. 349). But we are ignorant of the internal social-political conditions in Palestine, and these would certainly shape the fundamental ideas which we have been considering.

The general tenor of the O.T. itself suggests that Israel intro-

¹ It will be noticed how, on general grounds, it is tempting to associate Moses and the Exodus with such profoundly interesting and vital periods as (a) that of Ikhnaton's reform and the 'Amarna' age, or (b) the far-reaching movements, later, towards the close of the thirteenth century B.C. See p. 356, n. 2.

duced into Palestine, not a new god, Yahweh, but a new stage in the history of his development (cf. *e.g.* Ex. vi, 3). Just as, in the ninth century B.C., the prophet Elijah, in his fight against the Phœnician Baal, went down to Horeb for a new revelation of Yahweh (1 Kings xviii), so now, some new religious development is persistently connected with Horeb, but not with it nor with Sinai alone. Solemn law-givings and covenants are also associated with Kadesh, the plains of Moab, and Shechem—though what new ethical or other advance was due to Israel can hardly be gleaned from a criticism of the O.T. In any case, the tendencies in the Amarna age towards a supreme god in Palestine do not point to Yahweh, although the name Akhi-yawi may prove that he was known (p. 349). The far-reaching disturbances which shook the Levant in and about 1200 B.C. must have reacted upon Palestinian religion, but we can hardly conjecture their consequences. In fact, we do not know how Yahweh became the national god of the land. The evidence of personal names associates him slightly with the family of Moses, and with the age of David. But it is remarkable that we do not hear of an Edomite national god, like the Moabite Chemosh, or the Milcom of Ammon, nor is there any condemnation of the religion of Edom. If Yahweh had been worshipped by the two 'brother' peoples, Esau (Edom) and Jacob (Israel), it is possible that a purer cult always prevailed among the desert people outside the more civilized cities of Palestine itself (cf. vol. 1, pp. 194, 210 *sqq.*). On the other hand, the name of the god Hadad is especially associated with both Edom and Syria (above, pp. 349, 393), and in view of the prominence of Addu, or Hadad, in the Amarna period, we have to explain, in the first instance, how Hadad was ever replaced by Yahweh.

These two gods are closely related, and it is possible that the name Hadad, once familiar over the whole land, from north Syria to Edom, was suppressed by tribes united by the worship of Yahweh. The account of the Israelite conquest represents a mighty invasion, but certainly—on both internal and external grounds—*not* the actual event we have to postulate. The history of the age has been lost, though tradition has no doubt preserved some echoes of it.

The religion of the monarchical period so resembles that of the earlier age that Yahweh could not have been an entirely new type of god: we may compare the relation between Aton and the old Egyptian god Amon-Re, the former being an old name, though with a new meaning. We may further suppose that some great movement spread the name southwards into Edom, if not, indeed, to the Sinaitic peninsula and Midian; and that when in time the

original Yahweh-religion had deteriorated in Palestine itself, a new spirit animating it from the southern desert. On independent grounds it may be conjectured that the origin of the worship of Yahweh is to be associated with the Aramaean Sutu tribes of the north, and with this would agree the persistent tradition of the Aramaean origin of Israel and possibly the old prominence of the name of Seth (see p. 368 *sq.*, and vol. I, p. 234 *sq.*).

Such conjectures would explain some of the main facts, though not all. The oldest recognizable biblical traditions are fragmentary, because they have been subordinated to much later views of the past. New-comers from the desert would constantly settle down and lose their earlier simplicity of thought; the ascent in social conditions regularly meant a religious descent (cf. Deut. xxxiv). But O.T. history is concentrated upon *one* supreme event of this sort, and upon the struggle to maintain intact the early ideals. It is focussed upon *one* sweeping invasion from the south; whereas subsequently we shall find two movements that are of the utmost significance for the historical development of Israel, and, in certain respects, resemble the events which are assigned to the pre-monarchical period. They are of the ninth and seventh-sixth centuries B.C. respectively. Moreover, in the sixth and fifth centuries, we shall meet with another 'Exodus'—this time from Babylon; and there will be ecclesiastical and other vicissitudes, which, in turn, at least find a parallel in the narratives of the earlier period. And while this second 'Exodus' is, in a sense, an echo of the first (Is. xi, 15 *sq.*; xliii, 16–19; xlviii, 20 *sq.*), the account of the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest is, as we have seen, conflicting and confused, and, in the view of biblical critics, the constituent narratives *in their present form* are later than the ninth century, and partly even later than the sixth (cf. pp. 356, 363).

Although some very important traditions can be recognized, and it cannot be doubted that some knowledge was retained of the history of the second millennium B.C., we cannot be confident that events in Palestine ran along the lines laid down in our records. For the early history of Palestine the O.T. cannot be used as it stands. The ordinary histories and text-books are necessarily obliged to utilize the fruits of modern research, and present each some particular and possible reconstruction. But such are the internal difficulties and the unavoidable differences of opinion that it has seemed to the present writer undesirable to attempt yet another reconstruction which the progress of archaeological discovery might any day radically modify or overthrow. Much

can be gleaned from an independent survey of contemporary and external material. Moreover, we gain a great deal from the O.T. which has a meaning for history, could we fit it into a historical framework. But the internal complexities of the O.T. are such that every estimate of the course of Israelite history must take them into account, and fresh external evidence is needed for our interpretation of them. If much remains unknown and problematical, and we seem to lose much of the familiar biblical history, the fact remains that the so-called 'historical' books—the 'Former Prophets,' as they were styled, in contrast to the 'prophetical' books proper—were written under the influence of specific religious and other ideas. Truth of idea rather than of fact is the characteristic feature of the biblical history; and the ideas, being really independent of and separable from the form in which they have been expressed, are permanent, and capable of re-expression¹.

¹ Owing to the literary structure of the biblical narratives the problems of the earlier periods cannot be severed from those of the later. Among them is that of the extreme importance of the Edomite or South Palestinian *blq* for the rise of the Judaean monarchy (pp. 366 *sq.*, 389 *sq.*, 393). This was shown most completely and convincingly by E. Meyer in 1906 (*Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*; cf. J. Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 437), but an analysis of the history of Saul and David makes it doubtful whether the evidence actually refers to the history of Palestine in the twelfth-eleventh centuries. In any case, the conclusion reached in the preceding pages, that our sources are too imperfect for any consecutive and detailed account of the history, is confirmed when, in due course, we come to the monarchical period (vol. III). There we shall meet with much that connects it with the Amarna period (cf. p. 351 above) and with conditions among the surrounding peoples, and we shall find situations the cause of which we are unable to trace. It is a degraded Yahwism against which the prophets have to contend, and they presuppose conditions which do not lie before us in the records; for the records, as a whole, are later than the religious reforms of the great prophets, and reflect later conceptions of the earlier life and thought. As has already become evident (p. 402 *sq.*), 'archaeology' and 'criticism' combine to require a restatement of the historical development of Ancient Palestine; and a more careful historical criticism is necessary before the very intricate problems of the literary structure can be at all successfully handled (cf. p. 375).

INDEX TO NAMES

Abarim, Mt. B 1
 Ajlun, Jebel B 2
 Antilibanus, B 1
 Arbāh, The, B 2, 3
 Arabia, Desert of, D 5
 Argob, C 2
 Arnon, R. B 3
 Bahr Lūt, B 3
 Bashan, Hill of, C 2
 Bethel, D 3
 el-Buttauf, D 2
 Carmel, Mt. B 2
 Damascus, C 1
 Dead Sea, B 3, 3
 Dothān, Plain of, B 2
 Ebal, Mt. B 2 D 2
 Edom, B 4
 Engedi, B 3

Ephraim, Hill Country of, B 2
 Ephraim, Mt. D 2
 Esdrelon (Jezreel), Plain of, B 2
 Galilee, Lower, D 2
 Galilee, Upper, D 1
 Gennesaret, Lake of, B 2
 Genzīm, Mt. B 2, D 2
 Gilboa, Mt. B 2, D 2
 Gilead, Mts. of, B 2
 Hauran, C 2
 Hazzon Tamar, B 3
 Hebrōn, D 3
 Hermon, Mt. R 1, D 1
 Horomax, R. Yarmūq, B 2
 Hor, Mt. (Jebel Harūṭ), B 1, D 4
 Hulch, Lake, B 1
 Jabbok (Yabbok) Brook, B 2

Jaulān, Plateau of, B C 1, 2
 Jerusalem, B 3, 5, D 3
 Jezreel, Valley of, B 2, D 2
 Joppa, A 5
 Jordan, R. B 2
 Judaea, Wilderness of, B 3, D 3
 Kidron, R. B 3
 Kishōn, R. B 2
 Lebanon, Mt. B 1, D 1
 Lejā, The, C 1
 Leontes, R. B 1
 Lūtān, R. B 1, D 1
 Lydda, A 5
 Moab, B 3
 el-Mojib, W. B 3
 Nazareth, D 2
 Nebo, Mt. B 3, 5
 Negeb, The, A 4


Petra, B 4
 Philistia, Plain of, A 3
 Rās el-Abād (The Ladder of Tyre), B 1
 Rās en-Nākūrah, B 1
 Salt Sea, B 3
 Samaria, B 2
 Serr, Mt. B 4
 Sela, B 4
 Sharon, Plain of, A 2
 Shechem, B 2
 Shophēah, The, A 3
 Syrian Desert, C 1
 Tabor, Mt. B 2
 Tyre, B 1
 ez-Zerkā, Nahr, B 2

A

B

C

D



A

B

C

D

CHAPTER XV

THE CONTEMPORARY ART OF EGYPT AND THE NEAR EAST

I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT; ARCHITECTURE, SCULPTURE, Etc.

IN this chapter the term 'Near East' must be taken as excluding Cyprus, Asia Minor west of the Halys, and the Aegean lands, which at this period belong to the domain of prehistoric Greek art, and are treated in other chapters.

When we compare the Egyptian art of the XIIth Dynasty with that of the XVIIIth, with which this period opens, we are more than ever convinced that they were separated by no very long interval of time. In spite of differences, the resemblances are too great for us to suppose that so long an interval as 1650 years divided them, as is demanded by the chronological system of Petrie. This expanse of time separated the art of the XVIIIth Dynasty from that of the Roman period, and we see through what constant changes, periods of energy and florescence and of decadence and decline, altering fashions and varied inspiration, Egyptian art passed in 1650 years until the space of time that elapsed between the end of the Middle Kingdom and the first centuries of the Christian Era is bridged. It is incredible that the same space of time in the other direction should have separated the end of the Middle Kingdom from its beginning. The study of the art of the XVIIIth Dynasty alone, apart from other considerations, shows us that this view is hard to accept. If, on the other hand, it is difficult for historical reasons to credit the current theory that only two hundred years elapsed between the end of the XIIth Dynasty and the beginning of the XVIIIth, artistic considerations would not prevent its acceptance, so closely does the art of the later period seem to connect with that of the earlier, in spite of differences. But if we assume that there must be something wrong with the astronomical calculations that seem to insist on the shortest period, and we double the two hundred years, while historical exigencies will be satisfied artistic considerations will present no difficulty, and, indeed, the supposition that four hundred years instead of two elapsed between

the two dynasties will enable us much better to explain the differences between the two periods of artistic activity, differences that are somewhat difficult to account for on a theory of only two centuries of development (see vol. I, p. 169 *sq.*).

It would take too long to enumerate here the numerous points of resemblance which enable us to regard the art of the XVIIIth Dynasty as a development of that of the XIIth after an interval probably not exceeding four hundred years, and possibly less, or to recapitulate the many points of difference which are no more than would naturally be expected after so many years. For four hundred years are a long period in artistic development. We may think of the development of our own art from that of the age of Henry VIII and Charles V, how it differs, yet how it develops from the art of the early sixteenth century. Nor can we say in the case of Egypt that art might easily remain stagnant for over a thousand years in a country so cut off from the rest of the world and impermeable to outside influences. This would be a most superficial view, for, as a matter of fact, those who deal with the minutiae of Egyptian artistic style see that the unchanging Egyptian art of popular belief is more or less of a superstition; Egyptian art changed as much as Chinese, which also to the uninstructed appears changeless throughout the centuries. In both there was fixed by convention, mainly of religious origin, a general framework of style, within which, however, there was constant minor change of detail which definitely distinguishes to the *cognoscenti* the art of Han or T'ang or Sung or Ming, or that of the IVth or XIIth or XVIIIth or XXVIth Dynasties. And to the Chinese observer does there not seem to be the same general framework of style in European art from the days of Ictinus and Pheidias to those of our modern artists and architects, which, if he be unlearned in Western art, might give him the same impression of monotonous changelessness through two thousand years and more that our own unlearned derive from their vague and occasional contemplation of Chinese or of Egyptian art?

As a matter of fact Egyptian art between the XIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties could not have remained unchanged for centuries by foreign influence or internal convulsions, for at this very period an entirely new and disturbing element of foreign origin was introduced into the Egyptian mind by the Hyksos conquest, which subjected Egypt to the rule of foreigners (by no means so barbarous, probably, as her later historians were pleased to assert) for about two centuries. And we see the effect of this

intrusive factor in the art, as well as in the general life, of Egypt under the XVIIIth Dynasty. There is an alteration greater than that due to mere native developments, progressive or retrograde, such as caused the differences between the art of the IVth Dynasty and that of the XIIth, an alteration of spirit due to an altered outlook on the world. At the same time the framework of the national art is preserved, and the traditions of the XIIth Dynasty continue still so strong, that we see that the foreign domination can hardly have lasted longer than the two centuries we suppose, or the space of time between the two great artistic dynasties have covered much more than four. Indeed, it was probably for less than a century that the Hyksos continued a completely alien and wrecking element in the civilization of Egypt. They soon adopted Egyptian culture; the stone which fell into the machine stopped its working for a time, but it was not long before the wheels began again to revolve and the intrusive stone was ground to powder. The machine then worked freely again, but at an altered rate, and with an altered note after its accident, just as the machine of European culture and art started again with an altered note after the accidents of the Thirty Years' War, of the French Revolution, and of the European War of 1914-18.

The flourishing age of Egyptian art under the XIIth Dynasty was reborn under the XVIIIth, and we can fairly regard these as the two great artistic dynasties, the two periods at which Egyptian art was at its best. Fine things were made under the Old Kingdom, beautiful things under the Saïtes; but under the XIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties the Egyptian artists reached the height of their power.

We know from the inscription of Hatshepsut at the Speos Artemidos that one of the first charges of the restored native monarchy of the XVIIIth Dynasty was the restoration of the temples that had fallen into ruin during the time of the Hyksos. So little remains of the temple architecture of the XIIth Dynasty, or so little can be definitely assigned to that period, owing to the habit of later kings of placing their inscriptions on the columns and walls of their ancestors, that we do not know how far the architects of the XVIIIth improved upon the work of their predecessors. Until the time of the XIXth and XXth Dynasties Egyptian architecture seems to have altered little. Sennemut, who superintended the buildings of Hatshepsut, is generally credited with the remarkable design of the great queen's terrace-temple at Dēr el-Bah̄ri, on whose walls she commemorated her famous expedition to Puenet (Punt). But we now know that his design

was not original, having been derived from the terrace, approached by an ascending ramp, of the adjoining pyramid-temple of king Neb-hapet-Re Mentuhotep, of the XIth Dynasty. All Sennemut did was to make two terraces and two ramps instead of one, and the colonnades with their wall-reliefs which mask the escarpment of the terraces were but copied from the similar colonnades and reliefs of Neb-hapet-Re's temple¹. This may serve as a parable of the other temple-buildings of the XVIIIth Dynasty up till the time of Amenhotep III; they were larger editions, probably, of those of the Middle Kingdom.

Under Thutmose III we find a new development in the shape of long historical inscriptions, recording his conquests, engraved upon temple walls, and one of his architects tried a new and unpleasing device, never repeated, of placing the lotus-flower capitals upside down upon the columns. But his buildings generally, his colossi, and his obelisks and those of Hatshepsut (one of which was erected at Karnak within seven months of the beginning of its quarrying at Aswān), do not appear to mark any great advance. Amenhotep III set the fashion of erecting really enormous temples, which continued under the succeeding dynasties so long as there was the wherewithal to build them. The Hypostyle Hall at Karnak and the fallen colossus of 'Osymandyas' in the Ramesseum show this new *penchant* for huge size at the beginning of the succeeding dynasty, under Seti I and Ramses II. At Abydos the sculptors could decorate Seti's temple with delicately beautiful reliefs, but the temple itself and that of the same king at Kurna are clumsy and ugly: the first Egyptian buildings, perhaps, that can justly be so called. The architects were losing their old sense of proportion. We see the end coming swiftly at the beginning of the XXth Dynasty, when, though the pylons of Medinet Habu may be fine, the colonnades of the inner courts are simply hideous, with their fat sausage-like columns and huge square abaci, deeply carved with disproportionately enormous hieroglyphs. Egyptian temple-architecture in a little more than two centuries lost all the beauty that it had still pos-

¹ Thus all the dithyrambs that have been written about the originality of the queen and her architect appear to have little basis; and the queen's famous expedition to Puenet (Punt) had nothing original about it, being merely copied from the well-known expedition of the XIth Dynasty. Indeed it is not absolutely impossible that the whole story of her expedition is an invention, her Puenet reliefs being simply imitated from some on the temple of Mentuhotep which commemorated a real expedition in his time. On the other hand, it is reasonable to suppose that contemplation of the reliefs in the Mentuhotep temple impelled her to send an expedition to Puenet herself.

essed under the XVIIIth Dynasty. Exotic buildings, such as the outer grate-tower at Medinet Habu, with their crenellated battlements in imitation of an Asiatic fort or palace, show only a debased taste that turned to copy foreign models instead of seeking inspiration in its own splendid past. The temples themselves are now jerry-built, and would never have survived except in a land so free from earthquake as Egypt. See above, p. 179 *sq.*

The other arts tell the same tale. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty we see beauty and splendour carrying on the fine old traditions of the past and in some ways improving on them. Then, at the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty, after the collapse of the religious and artistic revolution of the 'heretic-king' Ikhnaton, which for a moment promised to give complete freedom from the conventional artistic framework, came a sudden bankruptcy of taste and conscientious work, decadence complete and irrevocable, which the Saïte archaistic revival, seeking to find new inspiration in the slavish imitation of the work of the time of the Pyramid-builders, could not arrest.

The sculptors of the XVIIIth Dynasty were no unworthy rivals of those of the XIIth. The tradition of faithful portraiture, so characteristic of Egyptian art, was preserved. It is not less faithful because it is less brutal, because it is more flattering. Royal portraits are more idealized; the heads of the young Thutmose III and the young Amenhotep III are evidently portraits, though not so brutally faithful as the forcible XIIth Dynasty portraits of Senusret III or Amenemhet III undoubtedly are. Private portraits may flatter, but they are none the less true, as many a statue testifies, notably those of the wise minister of Amenhotep III, Amenhotep son of Hapu. No finer portraits of a clever old man exist. Under Ikhnaton flattering idealism took an unexpected turn (see p. 120 *sq.*). The king desired to be made out uglier, instead of more beautiful, than he really was. His long head and jaws, his long neck and hunched shoulders, his heavy thighs and spindle shanks, were considered beautiful because they were royal. They were the fashion, and the portraits of this king and his court are the exaggerated fashion-plates of his time. To us they are frankly hideous; no human being could possibly have been quite so ugly as Ikhnaton liked to be represented in the passion for 'truth' that was part of his religion; and from various indications we know that he and his queen, his daughters and courtiers were not really such vicious degenerates as they chose to appear. A head of the king at Berlin, recently discovered at el-Amarna, is by no means exaggerated and is an interesting portrait,

and so is the small head of one of his daughters—'degenerate' perhaps, but extraordinarily refined; while a crowned head of queen Neferti-it, also at Berlin (a cast at Oxford), is probably the most naturalistic Egyptian portrait known. In this head the treatment of the eyes, especially, is notable for the abandonment of the customary convention, and its truth to life. The usual somewhat idealized truth in portraiture returned with Seti I; we know that the portraits of Seti and his son Ramses are likenesses (and in the case of Seti likenesses that had no need to flatter his fine head and face), from the evidence of their actual mummies. But after that time the idealization went so far as to destroy the portrait, and under the XXth Dynasty each king is represented exactly like another, with exactly the same conventional head and profile, imitated more or less from that of Seti. Under the XIXth Dynasty the portraits of private persons already become purely conventional. It was not till the time of the Ethiopian dynasties, heralding the artistic revival and archaism of the Saïtes, so that the tradition of faithful portraiture was again taken up, with the result that the portraits of the seventh and sixth centuries are often as fine and as true as are those of the XIIth Dynasty.

In the representation of the human body the Egyptian sculptors probably attained their highest level of achievement in the time of Amenhotep III and Ikhnaton, when the freedom permitted to artists allowed a naturalistic style of which the best examples are the nude statuettes of princesses found at el-Amarna.

Relief sculpture attained under the XVIIIth Dynasty a high degree of perfection, as we see in the temple of Dēr el-Bahri, in various temples and tombs of the reign of Amenhotep III, and in the tombs at el-Amarna. A famous relief in the Berlin Museum of the time of Amenhotep III shows the funeral procession of a high-priest of Memphis, in which the emotion of the grief-stricken sons of the dead man contrasts strikingly with the dignified sorrow of the great officials who follow them behind the bier. At el-Amarna the naturalism encouraged by the truth-loving 'heretic' king had full sway, and the reliefs executed by the king's sculptor Bek and his school are extraordinarily true to life. Whereas the reliefs of the first half of the dynasty, like those of the XIIth, had all been executed in low relief, a new style of sculpture in sunk relief or *cavo rilievo* had now come into fashion, in which the modelling of face and body is sunk within the outline of the figure, so that the relief does not project and is thus protected from injury. This artistic invention now became the most usual method of relief sculpture in Egypt, and though

we find true reliefs executed in fine white limestone in Seti's temple at Abydos, under the XIXth and XXth Dynasties, sunk relief is more generally employed. In it are executed the huge battle-reliefs of the time of Ramses II and Ramses III, in which we see the well-known gigantic representations of the king in his chariot striking down his enemies—Hittites, Philistines, or negroes. In these, in spite of the stiff conventionality of the whole, we can still admire the curiosity with which the Egyptian artists seized the characteristics of their foreign enemies, and have handed down to us their physiognomy with such accuracy that we are in no doubt as to their racial affinities. This contrasts greatly with the work of the later Assyrian sculptors, who show us Elamites and Semites of all kinds with exactly the same faces, useless as a means of racial identification, while the Assyrians themselves, kings and warriors, are all absolutely exactly alike, without the slightest attempt at characterization. But in the Egyptian reliefs after the XVIIIth Dynasty the Egyptians themselves are all very much alike, however: a stock Egyptian type had now been evolved, which it was not fashionable to alter: the artistic eccentricities of Ikhnaton had frightened the Egyptians off the path of originality in this respect. Ikhnaton's artists had perilously approached caricature, and, though one might caricature foreigners, it was no longer good taste to depict Egyptians with any but idealized form and features. So the sculptors took their revenge on the foreigners. Under the XXth Dynasty all Egyptians, male and female, are represented as exactly alike, of the same idealized type as their kings and queens; and now even the brutal portraits of foreigners are stereotyped, and a Semite or Libyan was to be represented for centuries, even down to Roman times, in the caricatured comic type invented by the XVIIIth Dynasty artists.

Here we see a striking contrast between Egyptian and Assyrian art. The humourless Babylonian or Assyrian never thought of caricaturing anybody in his decorative sculpture, whereas the Egyptian had a highly-developed sense of humour, to which his art constantly testifies; as a born portraitist and keen observer of the salient characteristics both of men and animals, he was also a born caricaturist, and Semites and negroes gave him a wide field for sly fun even in the most official and artistic records, while actual *jeux d'esprit* in the shape of jocular sketches on pots or bits of limestone are well known in our museums. The British Museum possesses a papyrus representing comic animals acting the parts of men: a fox driving geese, a lion playing at draughts with a

gazelle, and so forth, which shows a sense of humour closely akin to our own.

The reliefs, like the statues, were of course painted, delicately under the XVIIIth Dynasty, crudely and coarsely under the Ramessids. The characteristic Egyptian art of painting on the flat wall in distemper (not true fresco) which we have first met under the XIIth Dynasty, we know well under the XVIIIth from the decoration of the Theban tombs, notably those of Rekhmire the vizier of Thutmose III, or the beautiful little tomb of Nakht, with its painted vines. A fragment, from the tomb of a man of this period named Sebekhetep, now in the British Museum, shows us scenes of gentlemen and ladies carousing at a dinner-party while female musicians dance and play before them. Here the Egyptians are all alike, while another scene gives portraits of a company of Canaanite gift-bringers which show how the type of the Semite has persisted unchanging from that day to this. The smoke-blackened painting of the Minoan Cretan ambassadors 'from Keftiu and the Isles of the Sea' in the outer corridor of the tomb of Rekhmire would no doubt give us accurate portraits of Minoans could we but see them (now however well reproduced by Mrs de G. Davies); and the same might be said of those in the fragment of Sennemut's tomb were they not so damaged. Here, however, the Egyptian probably found less scope for his ability in caricature. The Minoans and Mycenaean might be considered strange, even weird; but they could not possibly be regarded as funny, like negroes and Semites.

In the decoration of the royal tombs the undertaker-painter found endless scope for the repetition of his gods and demons, and the closely related art of the illuminator of the Book of the Dead produced its finest results in such papyri as those of Nebseni and Ani. On royal tomb-walls and in papyri now appear imaginary maps of the Underworld, with its gates, its canals, and its guardian demons which under the Middle Kingdom we find painted on the great rectangular wooden coffins. Before the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty a change in taste had taken place with regard to the decoration of coffins. Under the XIIth Dynasty the inner cartonnage covering of the mummy had often been made with a head and face in human semblance, and in Upper Egypt not long before the time of the Hyksos invasion the old rectangular outer coffins gave place to human-headed coffins like the inner cartonnage, decorated in quite a new fashion, with the image of the goddess Nut on the breast, and the great protecting vulture-wings spread out over it, often heavily gilded.

This new fashion continued, with a simplification of the coffin, now usually decorated simply with a few bands of inscription. At the same time the numerous wooden models of retainers and labourers at work, of boats with warriors, and so forth, that had been a regular part of the funerary equipment, disappeared from the tombs, their place being taken by actual house-furniture, the objects of the toilet for the use of the dead being still retained. A boat found in the corridor of the tomb of king Amenhotep II at Thebes is the last example of the old fashion. At the same time the *shauabti* or *ushabti* figures, which doubtless represent the slain slaves of primitive times, and had first been introduced under the Middle Kingdom, appear now in greater numbers and more finely made than before, to perform their function of answering the call for the dead man whenever he was called upon to do work in the next world. Hitherto they had been made of stone: now bronze was (rarely) used also for their manufacture, and (commonly) faïence and painted wood. The classical examples for funerary furniture of the latter part of the XVIIIth Dynasty are the tomb of Iuaa and Tuiu, discovered and excavated by Mr J. E. Quibell for Mr Theodore Davis in 1906, and that of king Tutenkhamon, found by the late Lord Carnarvon and Mr Howard Carter in 1922.

II. SMALL ART, COSTUME, POTTERY, Etc.

The great resemblance of the faïence of the first half of the XVIIIth Dynasty to that of the Middle Kingdom is a considerable argument in favour of the comparative shortness of the period separating the two dynasties. Blue faïence with decoration in manganese black is characteristic of both dynasties, and it often demands the eye of an expert to decide to which period a dish or small vase of this material may be considered to belong. The scarab too, whether in faïence, or in a blue composition imitating lapis, or in steatite glazed green or blue, of the early XVIIIth Dynasty much resembles its congener of the Later Middle Kingdom. It was not till the time of Thutmose III that a new style of scarab, of steatite glazed with a brilliant green, and of a form distinct from any of earlier date, came into vogue and set the fashion for the design of these characteristic little objects of art for the future. At the same time the well-known spiral and lily-spiral designs on the bases of scarabs, so characteristic of the Middle Kingdom, disappeared, to reappear only for a time under the XIXth Dynasty in a debased form derived from the survival of Middle Kingdom designs in the Delta (where the XIXth

Dynasty originated and had its seat) owing to the strong Hyksos tradition there, and much later as a mere piece of archaism under the Ethiopians.

Scarabs of fine stones were no longer so commonly made. The taste for obsidian, blue felspar and amethyst as materials for scarabs and other small *objets d'art* went out; under the XVIIIth Dynasty the most popular stone was the cornelian, and this was more commonly used for beads, pendants, and rings than for scarabs. Red and green jaspers were also used, and the red became very common under the XIXth Dynasty, when sard was also much in vogue. Lapis-lazuli alone continued in unabated popularity at all times, and also its imitation in blue paste or actual glass. We do not, however, find the beautiful inlaid jewellery of gold with *cloisonné* ornament in fine stones that was so characteristic of the XIIth Dynasty. The jewellery of the XVIIIth Dynasty, of which fine examples were found by the British Museum excavators at Enkomi in Cyprus, and are now in the Museum, has more gold and less inlay (now of coloured composition), and is less tasteful and less beautifully made than that of the earlier age. The gold, which under the XIIth Dynasty had but supplied the framework of the beautiful stones, now completely dominated the work. Fine examples were found in the tomb of Iuaa and Tuiu, the parents of queen Tiy, at Thebes (time of Amenhotep III). Under the XIXth and XXth Dynasties, to judge from representations, jewellery was normally of gold without much inlay.

Fine examples of the metal-work of the XVIIIth Dynasty are the embossed silver bowls which probably were commonly made at this time, though not many examples have descended to us. The embossing represented sacred animals, or hunting scenes, or other miscellaneous subjects. These bowls were imitated much later by Phœnician metal-workers, and their imitations are found in Etruscan tombs.

The varied colours of jewellery inlaid in stones or composition were, towards the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty, imitated in faïence, when the earlier blue and green was supplemented by glazes of red, yellow, white, apple-green, violet, and chocolate-brown, which we find on scarabs and more commonly on small finger-rings. Some of these rings imitate, in polychrome glaze of red, blue, and green on yellow, golden rings with inlay of cornelian or jasper, lapis and felspar. A black glaze, imitating obsidian, seems not to have commended itself to Egyptian taste. A very dark brownish-green or black glass was, however, made, which closely imitates obsidian.

The Egyptian workers in hard stones at this time markedly neglected obsidian, with which such wonderful results had been effected under the XIIth Dynasty. The polychrome glazes are characteristic of the period of Amenhotep III, Ikhnaton, and their successors, and survived till the XXth Dynasty and later, but were then chiefly used for the inlay decoration of tiles. Such polychrome tiles were general under the XIXth and XXth Dynasties, and are often very beautiful. The classical example of their use is in the decoration of a palace of Ramses III at Tell el-Yehudiyeh in the Delta. Of these XXth Dynasty tiles there is a fine collection in the British Museum.

The use of these polychrome glazes followed the invention of variegated or polychrome glass, one of the greatest Egyptian inventions of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Under the XIIth Dynasty only blue glass was made, and so far as we know, chiefly in the form of spherical beads and other small objects; but in the first half of the XVIIIth Dynasty the process was invented whereby the glass-maker produced the wonderful vases and other objects of particoloured opaque glass which are among the greatest artistic treasures of this period, and are the ancestors of a long series of variegated glass manufactures that passed from Egypt to Phoenicia, Syria, and overseas, the products of which are well known to us generally as 'Phoenician,' 'Greek' or 'Etruscan' glass. Every collection contains specimens of this glass, usually Phoenician of the eighth to the fifth centuries B.C., in the characteristic 'alabastron' shape of that period, and with its wavy or zigzag lines of different colours, blue and yellow predominating, coursing with rainbow-like effect round the bottle. Pretty as this later glass is, it cannot compare in fineness and beauty with its ancestor, the original Egyptian opaque polychrome glass of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Even the superficial observer can see the difference when specimens of the two periods are placed side by side: the solidity and brilliance of the old glass is unmistakable. The first examples are of the time of Thutmose III, Amenhotep II and Amenhotep III. It is at the inception of the new art that the colours are most brilliant and most delicate. In the British Museum is a beautiful little vase (No. 4742) of pale blue, almost dove-coloured glass, with waved bands of darker blue and occasional touches of yellow. Others (4740, 4741, 22,819) are of a magnificent deep lapis blue with white, yellow, or lighter blue bands; another (26,301) is sepia-brown with yellow lines, and another (36,282) a brilliant black, exactly resembling obsidian, with decoration of friezes of yellow and white waves so disposed as

almost to imitate palmettes, bordered by bright yellow lines, and contrasting finely with the alternating bands of the black base-glass of the vase. This object is unluckily broken, but was unusually large, and must have been a splendid example of the glass-maker's art. Had it not been broken it would have been the finest object of XVIIIth Dynasty glass in existence. The two finest, or, at least, the two most brilliant specimens of this glass-ware that we have are in the collection of the late Earl of Carnarvon; an ewer of turquoise blue with chevrons of white and dark blue, and a four-handled vase of lapis blue with waves of yellow, white, and light blue. The most delicate example known is probably the No. 4740 of the British Museum, mentioned above.

Glass vases all of one colour were naturally made; and one of the finest known of these is a drinking-cup of fine turquoise blue, which was in the possession of Lord Carnarvon, and was bequeathed by him to the New York Museum.

The fine taste shown in the choice of colour in these beautiful objects, and in their combination and contrast of colours, was an inheritance from the XIIth Dynasty, and shows that the artists of the XVIIIth Dynasty were in no way unworthy of their ancestors. The idea of variegated glass was no doubt derived from banded and zoned stones.

The chalcedony and agate which were so commonly used in Mesopotamia for the manufacture of cylinder-seals, etc., were not popular in Egypt, chalcedony being only used for a short time under the XIXth Dynasty, when oriental influences were strong. A blue marble, which is characteristic of the XIIth Dynasty for the manufacture of small pots for eye-paint (stibium) and unguents, was not so popular under the XVIIIth, its place being taken by the Egyptian yellow aragonite (often miscalled 'banded alabaster'), which, universally used under the Old Kingdom, less generally under the XIIth Dynasty, now came back into favour for vase-making. The fine white 'oriental' alabaster was rarely employed till the Saïte period. In the tomb of Tutenkhamon were found some extraordinary vases of aragonite with their stands, also of aragonite, and water-plants represented as issuing from and clustering around the vases—all in one piece. The effect is ugly, and the whole thing in doubtful taste, reminding us of the early Victorian atrocities in white marble. The Egyptian was by no means always faultless in his taste at this time.

Ivory and wood continued to be among the materials most beloved of the Egyptian artist-craftsman. We miss such things as the delicate little funerary portrait-figures of fine wood that are so

characteristic of the XIIth Dynasty, the ivory seals in the form of a negro or a boy seated on the ground, or such masterpieces as the wonderful little ivory head of the Hyksos king-sphinx grasping a prostrate Egyptian by both ears and looking out over him into space with an extraordinary expression of immovable calm and majesty (formerly in the collection of the late Mr Russell Rea, and now in the British Museum, No. 54,678). This, and the Ist Dynasty figure of a king mentioned in vol. I, p. 573 (British Museum No. 37,996), are probably the two finest examples in the round of Egyptian small art in ivory that exist. We have nothing from the XVIIIth Dynasty or later to compete with them, though we cannot but suppose that the artists of Ikhnaton's time must have made things in this genre almost as fine in their own way. XVIIIth Dynasty ivory work is, however, not very common. Objects of wood, on the contrary, are well known. Fine woods, especially foreign woods, were much prized and used. All the chief museums possess specimens of little spoons and lidded boxes in the form of flowers or fish, with handles in the shape of a jackal, or in the form of a vase borne on the shoulders of a graceful girl or of an ugly dwarf, whose figure served as the handle. These are typical products of the XVIIIth Dynasty. They are often inlaid with ivory, plain or stained, sometimes, with a most delicate blue.

In nothing is the delicate art of this time so well to be observed as in the forms and decoration of the toilet articles that are found in tombs or house-ruins, such as the spoons and boxes mentioned above, the stibium-pots of aragonite, glazed steatite, ivory, wood or polychrome glass, the ivory or bronze mirror-handles and razors, and the wooden boxes, that held them, inlaid with stained ivory, and so forth. The stibium-pots are often in the form of the misshapen dwarf-god Bes, who now appears for the first time as the patron-god, or as we should say, the mascot, of ladies' toilet-tables. He, or a beautiful girl, or the goddess Hathor, or a negro slave-boy, is the motive whenever the human form appears. It is a more sensuous and more luxurious age into which we have come. The severely beautiful taste and sense of proportion that dominated XIIth Dynasty Egypt has passed, and we are in an age not less tasteful in its own way, but in a different and less pure way. Its delicacy is not the delicacy of the XIIth Dynasty. It is less honest, more subtle; it is just beginning to be a little artificial. Artistic Egypt, after passing through her childhood in the predynastic period, her hoydenish days in the archaic age, her adolescence under the Old Kingdom, was under the

XIIth Dynasty still, though mature, a young and beautiful woman, with no need of adventitious aids to increase her simple and straightforward charms. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty she is still beautiful, but no longer young, still charming, but with the charm of the middle-aged woman of fashion, *un peu passée, un peu fardée*. Under the XVIIIth Dynasty we are still dealing with people of charm and refinement, though we see in their civilization a touch of artificiality hitherto unknown, and a hint of exotic taste due to the new connection with Asia brought about by the expulsion of the Hyksos and the consequent extension of Egyptian domination over Syria as far as the Euphrates. It was not, however, till the time of the next dynasty that the foreign influence seriously affected Egyptian art, and then only to the extent of modifying it in details.

The Egyptians always remained true to their peculiar national characteristics in art as in other things. The el-Amarna development was of native origin and its naturalism is Egyptian in spirit, though it is not to be denied that there is a probability of considerable influence from Minoan Greece, the isles of Keftiu, making for freedom and unconventionality. We actually see direct proof of such influence in details at el-Amarna itself, in the spiral volute decorations of Ikhnaton's palace-pillars, reviving a motive, originally Aegean, which had been popular in Egypt under the XIIth Dynasty. But this foreign influence is not to be exaggerated under the XVIIIth Dynasty, even at el-Amarna.

Intercourse with the foreigner for instance had but little influence over so characteristic a feature of Egyptian art as costume, which may conveniently be treated after the artistic objects of the toilet. As in modern India, ancient nations clung to their own costumes as national and tribal marks: there was no universal standard dress for the sexes, such as in modern days is dictated from London and Paris, nor was the idea conceivable till after Alexander's time or realizable till that of Augustus. And with the dissolution of the Roman Empire every isolated land went its own way again in the matter till the modern European universality in costume took shape in the sixteenth and was completed in the nineteenth century. In ancient Egypt, the simple white linen waistcloth was always the national male costume; the voluminous parti-coloured robes of the Semites were never adopted there, though we see from the little ivory figure of a king (p. 419) that in the early days such robes were probably not unknown; the king could always wear colours. But by the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty additions had been made to this primitive dress (*cf.* p. 99). Under

the XIIth an over-dress was often worn, hanging from a band round the body just beneath the armpits, and under the XVIIIth Dynasty we find that a light cape has been added to this to cover the shoulders, and the linen material of the whole is beautifully fluted or gauffed; the skirt, too, of the over-dress becomes more voluminous. Sometimes it hangs not from the armpits but from the waist, so that there is a hiatus of naked body between it and the cape. At other times the cape combines with the over-dress and becomes a pair of short sleeves. Still no colour is permitted, even in the full-dress of the ordinary man of importance. The king alone at first seems to have worn colour in his ceremonial garments, like the gods; but now colour is beginning to appear, also, in the garments of princes. A royal robe was found in the tomb of Tutenkhamon.

Women now wore instead of the ancient close-fitting 'hobble-skirted' dress depending from the shoulders by braces, which goddesses are still depicted as wearing, a more graceful, less closely fitting but still clinging garment with freer skirts, made of the same fluted linen material as the clothes of the men, but possibly with more colour, though the blue characteristic of the XIIth Dynasty does not seem to have been popular now. This dress covered the shoulders and was held in place by some sort of fastening or brooch, usually beneath the right breast. The male cape was sometimes worn as well. Sandals of wood and leather were worn by both sexes of the upper class. Children of both sexes still went about till their 'teens stark naked except for earrings and a necklace, or, in the case of girls, a string of beads round the middle. Earrings do not seem to have been generally worn by either sex till after the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty, when they were probably introduced from Asia. Both boys and girls, men and women, now had their ears pierced, and even when not actually depicted wearing earrings, the holes in the ear-lobes are usually shown in their portraits and in the *shauabti*-figures. The earrings were usually either, in the case of women, in the form of gold rosette-plaques hanging from a small ring, or, for men, large gold rings gripping the lobe and depending from a thin straight wire passed through it. Ear-studs were also used. Armlets or bangles and necklaces of gold and fine stones or faïence were also worn by both sexes, as had always been the custom, and were commonly bestowed by the kings on those whom they delighted to honour. The necklaces were now usually of gold and red stones, such as jasper and cornelian, which were the fashion. They were ordinarily of the well-known *uesekh*-form with successive rows of beads and pendants, a gold clasp usually in the

form of a hawk's head at each end, and a counterweight, the *menat*, at the back to keep the heavy necklace in position.

The wig worn by the shaven-pated men had now become larger and more voluminous, though it is supposed by some that the characteristic heavy male coiffure of the XVIIIth Dynasty was really a short wig worn over the natural hair grown long enough to hang down on either side of the face to the shoulders. This may indeed have been the fashion under the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties: the representations of Egyptian warriors fighting in Syria in the reliefs of this time look as if the natural hair were worn on campaigns, and the wigs left at home; from this may have arisen a fashion of still wearing the hair when at home, with the wig over it on full-dress occasions, as the women had usually worn it from the earliest times. After the XIXth Dynasty, however, the old male fashion of shaving the head was certainly resumed permanently. Boys always wore the side-lock of youth, the long plait of their own hair pendent to the shoulder on the right side of the head, the rest of which was shaven. Princes wore this adorned with clasps of gold. Small girls also wore it, the rest of the hair being in their case not always shaven. Women generally wore either their natural hair alone or with long and heavy wigs over it. Sometimes, however, their heads were shaven to wear the great wig with greater comfort, and queens (as, for instance, the consort of Ikhnaton), like their husbands, often were shaven and had no wig when the royal crown was worn.

Art in costume, as we have seen, had little use for bright colours. But these were not eschewed in woven materials not used for dress. The art of weaving in coloured stuffs was a most ancient one in the East, and at the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, as under the XIIth, the Egyptians were adepts in the production of such stuffs to be used for hangings, tent-covers, awnings, cushions and so forth. The geometrical patterns of such of these as have survived on the tombs to our own time, or are represented in wall-paintings, can often be exactly paralleled in Syrian carpets and rugs of the present day. We cannot regard these patterns as an importation into Egypt from ancient Syria, however. They were a native Egyptian art as long before as the time of the Ist Dynasty, when we find the oft-mentioned little ivory figure of a king in the British Museum, wearing a robe of such patterns, obviously of woven stuff. The groundwork of such patterned materials will usually have been of linen, the Egyptian national fabric, so to speak, and probably a most ancient Egyptian invention in the Delta, where flax chiefly grew. In

Syria no doubt wool was chiefly used. But in Egypt wool was never used for clothes except by foreigners, and probably rarely even for other purposes till Greek times¹. The hieroglyphics were naturally often used as decoration for linen fabrics: we have a fine example in the piece of tapestry woven on linen, which is *semé* of lilies with the title and prenomen of Amenhotep II, found in the tomb of Thutmose IV, and published in colour in the late Mr Theodore Davis's monograph on that tomb and its contents. It may have been a royal robe. The technique of this weaving differs but little from that of the present day.

A remarkable work of art, of a different kind, found in the same tomb is a chariot-body, panelled with wood overlaid with a canvas base for stucco, which is modelled with warlike scenes and ornamentation in very low relief, giving it almost the appearance of stamped leather, which it is possibly intended to imitate for funerary purposes, since leather was ordinarily used for the sides of chariot-bodies, as we see from that of the prince Iuaa (in the time of Amenhotep III), also found by Mr Davis and published by him. This fine example of XVIIIth Dynasty art is preserved in the Cairo Museum, like the tapestry mentioned above.

The appearance of the horse and chariot in Egypt with the Hyksos gave the Egyptian artists a new animal to draw, and a new object to design and make. The foreign thing was made in the foreign way, but it is probable that in Egypt was developed a light chariot much less bulky than the war-cars of the Canaanites, and suitable for swift driving over the desert. Nevertheless, the construction of the Egyptian chariot shows that mechanical principles were not yet well understood: instead of being over the axle, the car is in front of it, so that all the weight rested unnecessarily on the horses. The danger of overturning was minimized by the very broad gauge of the wheels². These were covered with leathern tyres, looking very like the solid tyres of the old-fashioned bicycle. Leather was also used for the sides of the body, laid over wood, which was used for its construction.

¹ A fragment of woollen material, possibly but not certainly a vesture, was found at Amarna in 1921 by T. E. Peet. It may have belonged to a foreign garment.

² An interesting description of the rough usage which the Egyptian chariot underwent in the rough mountainous ways of Palestine and Syria, of the breakdowns to which it was subject and the repairs necessary to it, of the various hairbreadth adventures which an Egyptian messenger driving his own chariot met with, and so forth can be found in the literary treatise known as 'The Travels of an Egyptian,' written under the XIXth Dynasty as an essay in polite writing (Papyrus Anastasi I). See p. 326.

Several dismantled chariots have been found in the tomb of Tutenkhamon, in addition to that found previously in the tomb of Iuaa.

On account of the badness of the indigenous Egyptian woods, which are neither tough nor strong, the wood preferably used in the construction of chariots was foreign, such as beech, while the bark of the birch-tree served as a decoration. The birch-bark, which must have come (if we rule Italy or Macedonia out) from Anatolia or North Persia, was apparently much admired, and used to decorate sticks and staves, as also was cherry-bark, which certainly came from Persia and the Caucasus region. The beech-wood may have come from Anatolia and Greece. The great cedars of Lebanon still provided Egypt with good wood; but cedar or other pine-wood was apparently not used for funerary purposes so much as under the XIIth Dynasty, when the great Syrian trunks provided most of the wood for the huge rectangular coffins of the time. The coffin-makers now largely used acacia, sycamine or other bad Egyptian woods, whose defects could be concealed by the thick coating of gesso and linen on which the decoration was painted.

Furniture was now made of cedar and of other rarer woods, such as ebony, combined with ivory and heavily gilded with the thin gold-plate that the Egyptian gilders used, generally laid over stucco, which was often finely modelled in the style of the chariot mentioned above. The chairs of the XVIIIth Dynasty are often beautifully made, and in their decoration we see carved new and graceful motives of ibexes or other animals, or the figures of Bes, the deity of the toilet, or of the hippopotamus Taueret. These combined with the heavy gilding, again show us a taste more fanciful and luxurious but in no way less artistic than that of the preceding age. Magnificent examples of furniture of this kind have been found in the tombs of Iuaa and Tutenkhamon. Boxes of wood, inlaid with semi-precious stones, stained ivory and blue faïence, were common; the two royal tombs mentioned have yielded very fine examples of this technique. There is a box from Tutenkhamon's tomb painted in delicate miniature with scenes of the royal androsphinx trampling down his enemies, etc. As a cabinet-maker the Egyptian was only rivalled by the great Englishmen of the eighteenth century or by the Japanese; and though the very finest of his works were probably made under the Old Kingdom and the XIIth Dynasty, the works of the XVIIIth, which alone have come down to us in any number, are beautiful enough.

The pottery has not the interest of the faïence ware, which

is really a soft siliceous sandy composition, held together by some gum or mucilaginous matter, and covered with the glaze. Vases and other objects of faience were commonly built up or carved out of a ball of the dried material: it seems impossible that such a substance could ever have been fashioned on the wheel. Sometimes a mould was used, and separate portions of vases were moulded apart and joined by the glaze. Real pottery was, of course, made on the wheel, which had been introduced into Egypt under the Old Kingdom. The usual ware of the XVIIIth Dynasty was red and rough: at the beginning of the period we find it ornamented with spots or crosses of white; later on a white slip covers the whole pot, and horizontal stripes of red, blue or green paint appear, followed by decorative plant-motives in these colours, sometimes formal lily-petal designs, sometimes naturalistic plants and flowers, such as grapes, daisies and so forth. Pots have egg-shaped bodies with cylindrical necks, with or without handles; there are great amphorae with almost pointed bases, sometimes with the handles perched on the shoulders of the vase; small squat pots with globular or carinated body, and small bottles with deeply indented necks, somewhat resembling a modern *kulla*, which had already appeared under the XIIth Dynasty, were very common.

'Pilgrim-bottles,' coystrels, or flasks, sometimes with two or even three handles, of a ware with a highly-polished yellow face, or sometimes pinkish-red, and long bottles of a brilliantly polished hard red ware, which were now common, are possibly not of Egyptian make, but were imported from Syria. As regards the last, however, this is not absolutely certain, since vases in the shape of *genre* figures, squatting men and kneeling women, dwarfs and negresses, of Egyptian design, were made in the same ware. These may, however, have been manufactured in Syria for the Egyptian market, and there is no doubt that the long bottles must come from the same place as the very similar smaller clay vases with a black leather-like surface, commonly found in Egypt in deposits of this time, and equally common in Palestine and Cyprus, that are certainly Syrian or Palestinian. These small jugs are often double. A big jug of this ware, usually decorated with cross-lines in white paint, is a characteristic object of the time, and is to be seen in most collections. This Palestinian black ware is probably related to a harder black ware, in which we find shapely little vases, usually associated with 'punctuated' decoration in white, sometimes with white spirals, which was contemporary with the Hyksos in Egypt, and is probably to be

ascribed to them, though, oddly enough, it is found as far south as Nubia. Other foreign wares were imported into Egypt at this time, notably the characteristic varnish-painted pottery of the Greek Later Bronze Age, just as under the XIIth Dynasty the polychrome wares of the Cretan Middle Bronze Age had been in demand there. Cretan vases of the best Minoan period, contemporary with the early XVIIIth Dynasty, though not unknown, are not so common as those of the Mycenaean age (Late Helladic or Late Minoan III) from Rhodes and the Greek mainland. The characteristic stirrup-vase or *Bügelkanne* of this period was extremely popular in Egypt from the end of the XVIIth Dynasty to the beginning of the XXth (1400–1200 B.C.), and was constantly imitated by the Egyptians in faïence and in aragonite. The Cretan 'filler' jugs in the shape of a beer-warmer were also imitated in faïence (Brit. Mus. No. 22,731).

The faïence wares of this time follow the lead of the-unglazed pottery as regards forms, and also imitate metal pots with ribbed sides (XXth–XXIInd Dynasties), or develop shapes of their own like the beautiful little cups made in the form of lotus flowers, or with modelled designs of hunting-scenes, etc., on them in relief, which have mostly been found at Tûna, and are of the XVIIIth–XIXth Dynasties. These are built up in the faïence material (see p. 425, above), and are not made on the wheel.

After the time of the XIXth Dynasty the ordinary pottery becomes entirely uninteresting, and is always red with a soft or hard white slip, plain, or painted with crude lotus or other designs.

III. SYRIA AND THE EAST

When we turn from Egypt to the neighbouring land of Canaan, we pass from a land of taste and art into one that from the artistic point of view seems barbarous indeed. Perhaps unjustly so, for our researches have hardly progressed far enough to permit us to say that no art worthy the name existed at this time in Canaan. And constant wars may well have prevented the development of an artistic spirit and destroyed time after time the attempt of civilization to express itself in art. We know that the Canaanites could make fine weapons of bronze as well as chariots: they or the Syrians gave new forms of weapons to Egypt (such as the *khopesh*-scimitar and the war-pick; vol. I, p. 572) and equipped her with the chariot. The descriptions of the booty captured by the army of Thutmose III at Megiddo show us that the Canaanites then possessed things of price, products of a by

no means inartistic culture; but war destroyed them. As it is, we find in Palestinian excavations nothing in the way of art but a great quantity of pottery (which has none of the beauty of the Egyptian glazed ceramic), rude clay figures and bronze weapons. Nevertheless, this Canaanite pottery, with its black leather-like white-smears, jugs and ewers, and its pots in the form of bulls, was much imported into both Egypt and Cyprus, where it is constantly found in tombs of this age. And a finer red-polished ware seems to have come to Egypt from farther north, from Syria proper (see p. 425). In the last century of our period, after the Migration of the Northerners in the days of Ramses III had brought the Philistines, probably from Lycia and Crete, into the Shephelah, we find relics of their European culture in the shape of 'sub-Mycenaean' pottery, some of it imported, some very possibly made on the spot. But no finer works of this civilization have been found, and it is very probable that there were none, this period being that of the decadence of Minoan-Mycenaean art and the beginning of the revolution that substituted iron for bronze in the armament and tool-equipment of the peoples of the Aegean. Of the Syrian art of the period before the Philistine invasion we know much more, and can see in the Egyptian art of the XVIIIth Dynasty motives obviously of Syrian origin. And when the ancient sites of Syria are systematically explored we may know better, and learn that at this time the arts were by no means neglected there. Cilicia, too, a home of ancient civilization, may prove to have been then the seat of considerable artistic activity. As yet no excavations have been carried out there, but if, as seems possible, the lands of Arzawa and Alashiya, so often mentioned as inhabited by civilized people during the XVIIIth Dynasty, are to be placed in Cilicia, we may have high hopes of the results of exploration. The excavations that have been made in Cyprus have shown us that this island was already the meeting-place of Egyptian and Aegean civilization and art, and to them in Cyprus was joined a third artistic element, which shows affinities to Minoan and to Babylonian and to Hittite art, and has also in it a fourth element that we can only ascribe to Syria. It is to Cilicia that we must probably assign the origin of this mixed art, which we know chiefly from objects in carved wood and ivory, boxes, mirror handles and the like, which have been found in Egypt as well as in Cyprus.

The Syrian artistic characteristics of which we have spoken are difficult to define, but we do find in Cyprus at this time, and in Syria itself later on, an artistic tradition, strongly influenced

by the Babylonian and Hittite arts, yet obviously independent of them. Of Phoenician art as such we cannot as yet speak, for we know nothing of it at this time. In later times, when we meet with it, it never shows any originality, but is a tasteless combination of the arts of the surrounding peoples; and no doubt what there was of Phoenician art in earlier days was of the same character. It is in the metal vases and animal-headed rhytons depicted by the Egyptians as Syrian tribute, and in stone seals and carved ivories, always a favourite form of artistic expression in this part of the world, that we see this Syrian art both now and later, when the famous ivories of Assyria show us unmistakable Syrian motives.

Hittite art in its turn owed much to Syrian and to Babylonian influences transmitted either through Syria or direct by way of the upper reaches of the Tigris, through the country already beginning to be known as Assyria, a Semitic land which at a very early period had received and assimilated the 'Sumerian' art of the originally non-Semitic Babylonians. Recent discoveries have shown that eastern Anatolia, the land east of the Hállys, was at the time of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (c. 2000 B.C.) inhabited by Semites of Babylonian culture. Possibly at or not long before the time of the convulsions that caused the Hyksos invasion of Egypt, among other events the Hittites first entered eastern Anatolia¹, and first dominated and then assimilated the Semitic inhabitants. Certainly they assimilated many elements of their Babylonian art; but in spite of this their artistic works, which are known to us only in the domains of sculpture and seal-engraving, remained distinctly and characteristically peculiar in type, and persisted in this type even when in later days Hittite colonists in Syria, subjected for centuries to Syrian influences, decorated with reliefs, resembling those of the Assyrians, the palaces of their princes at Carchemish.

The peculiar traits of this art, with its strange figures of high-crowned gods and goddesses walking on mountains, its warriors with battle-axes and long pigtails, its round-capped and long-robed priests carrying the sacred lituus, like the Etruscans to whom the Hittites were traditionally said to be related, are well known to all students of ancient art. The Babylonian influence is evident, also the different impress of Syria: of Minoan influence we can see little trace, and the Egyptian is only visible rarely and then probably altered *en route* through Syria. But the native

¹ All speculations on this point are, however, peculiarly hazardous at the present moment, when the 'Kanesian' Hittite (Indo-European?) texts of Boghaz Keui are being interpreted, and are yearly giving us new and unexpected facts with regard to the early history of Anatolia.

style dominates and merely adapts the others. The Hittites were very fond of seal-making, which they no doubt inherited from their Babylonized predecessors, but here again the national motives dominate the designs. The excavations at Carchemish should give us some knowledge of the pottery of the later Hittite and the earlier Syrian inhabitants of that region, which unhappily was neglected by the tablet-hunters of Boghaz Keui. A typical form seems to have been a high kalyx resembling a champagne-glass.

We now turn to Babylonia, of which Assyria is as yet but a more or less independent outpost. It is to be regretted that we know so little of Babylonian art at this period. Of the old Sumerian art we could say much, and it was a by no means inferior rival of the contemporary art of the Old Kingdom in Egypt. But when the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties ruled in Egypt, and Egyptian art was in its most splendid, though perhaps not its most tasteful period, Babylonia was governed by the long and monotonous series of foreign Kassite kings, of whom we know hardly anything but their names, and often not even their names; and in their time Babylonian culture seems stagnant and its art absolutely dull and uninspired. One can hardly recall a single important work of art of this age in our museums; there are boundary-stones with conventional and often rude representations of gods and demons; there are an endless series of cylinder-seals, all more or less alike: the list is a miserable one. It may be that we have been unlucky as regards this period, and that there were important works of art that have been destroyed or are still buried and have hitherto eluded our spades: Kassite sites have hardly been excavated yet. But up to the present we have little or nothing; the Kassite period seems a millennium of dullness. Until the convulsions of the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty in Syria and the threatening attitude of both the Hittites and Assyrians drove the Kassite monarchs into some semblance of activity, Babylonia seems to have had no history; and it may well be that this political inactivity reacted upon the artistic energies of the people, and condemned them to sterility in this regard.

It was now that Assyria first began to stir, and the relics of early Assyrian art found at Kala'at Sherkat show that Ashur owed her artistic inspiration to Babylon. But it is a mistake to lump Assyrian and Babylonian art together. To the superficial observer they may seem one, but to the student very considerable divergences of spirit are easily perceptible. The Assyrians were primarily a Semitic people of Sumerian culture, like the northern Babylonians of Akkad, their near relatives; but they had also in

them another ethnic element, probably identical with that which nowadays we call Kurdish. Whether the Kurds were originally Aryans, or, as seems quite as likely, a people of Caucasian or Alarodian affinities, like the Georgians, who learnt to talk Iranian at the time of the great Indo-European invasion about 2000 B.C., we do not know. In any case, they neither are nor were Semites, and it was probably they who gave the Semitic-speaking Assyrians that touch of difference that distinguishes them from the Babylonians, which is reflected in the divergences of their art from the true Babylonian, notwithstanding its general Babylonian character. The western Semites of Syria, with their peculiar art, strongly influenced now by exotic ideas from Egypt and from the western lands of Anatolia and the Isles of the Sea, also had much to say to the development of Assyrian culture. We know but little of its artistic progress as yet. Examples of fine ceramic with polychrome glaze, dating probably from the period roughly contemporary with the XVIIIth–XIXth Dynasties, have been found at Kala'at Sherkat (Ashur) by the Germans, and, if this date is correct, they show that the art of glazing in colour had quickly passed from Egypt if not already to Mesopotamia, at all events to northern Syria¹. If really Assyrian (which is very doubtful) this glazed ceramic already assumes a distinctive character of its own, maintained in the glazed tiles and bricks of later days down to the period of the Ishtar Gate of Babylon and the Frieze of the Archers at Susa. But so far as sculpture is concerned, it is not till after the end of this period, in the ninth century, that Assyrian art makes its grand entrance on the scene in the reliefs and lions of the palace of Ashur-naṣir-pal III (884–860 B.C.), at Calah (Nimrūd), which were an earnest of the triumphs of the sculptors of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh two centuries later. To the same period, or somewhat earlier, but still outside the limits of this chapter, must be assigned the native North-Syrian or Aramaean sculpture of Zenjirli and Sakjegözü, with its ruder version from the palace of the prince Kapara at Tell Halaf, which has close connections with the art of Assyria, and strongly influenced the Hittite art of Carchemish.

¹ Among this glazed ware from Kala'at Sherkat (now in the British Museum, and shortly to be published by Dr Andrae) is some that, as the present writer has observed, is identical with the glazed ware rhytons in the form of women's heads, a horse's head, etc., found at Enkomi in Cyprus, also in the British Museum. This ceramic has usually been regarded as Minoan. It can hardly be Assyrian. Did it come to Enkomi and to Ashur from a common source, perhaps in Cilicia or Northern Syria? The identity of a woman's head rhyton from Ashur and those from Enkomi is absolute. They are from the same manufactory.

CHAPTER XVI

CRETE AND MYCENAE

I. CRETE: LATE MINOAN I

SOON after 1600 B.C. the prehistoric civilization of Crete reached the zenith of its power and wealth during the first two phases of the Late Minoan Period (1600–1400 B.C.), and, though after its collapse about the beginning of the Third Late Minoan Period the Minoan culture still flourished in Crete, it was then completely overshadowed by—and perhaps even subordinate to—the newly-arisen and widely-spread power of Mycenae. At the end of the Bronze Age, about the end of the twelfth century B.C., the movement known as the Dorian Invasion, which coincided with the beginning of the Iron Age, overwhelmed both alike in a common ruin (see chap. xix). Then ensued a period of disturbance and mediaeval obscurity till the eighth century B.C., when began the renaissance of civilization and art, which was the great classical period of Greece and the basis of all modern culture¹.

The number of sites where Late Minoan remains have been found in Crete, to say nothing of their richness and material excellence, shows at once that the island was comparatively thickly populated by a busy, prosperous and cultivated race. The arrangement, decoration and equipment of the palaces imply an elaborate social and political life; the workshops of the craftsmen testify to their skill and industry; trade, navigation and travel were freely pursued and even reading, writing and arithmetic were common. The picture of this lost civilization, which had been guessed at for some time past, has only been restored to us

¹ As mentioned in vol. I, p. 597, shortly before the end of Middle Minoan III the palace of Cnossus was destroyed and rebuilt, and this rebuilding marks the beginning of a new culture epoch. The actual division between Middle Minoan III and Late Minoan I is not strongly marked (Middle Minoan III *b* and Late Minoan I *a* are not easy to separate), and consequently many of the objects referred to here should perhaps more correctly be placed in Middle Minoan III *b*, but that, however, does not affect the purpose of the present chapter, which is to describe the history of Aegean civilization from 1600 B.C. onwards.

in the last twenty years. It reveals to us the brilliant material background, of which Homer is the epitome, and shows the 'Golden Age' of which classical Hellas dreamed, when she looked back to her origin.

The great centre of authority in Crete and the islands during this period (Late Minoan I and II) was Cnossus, though Phaestus was also a city of the first importance. The list of sites where there were important towns is a long one. Tylissos, Mallia (the exploration of which has only just begun), Gournia, Pseira, Palaiakastro and Zakro are the towns which have contributed most to our knowledge of this period. At all of them the town-system is well developed: there are narrow paved streets winding among blocks of houses, and where the slopes are steep, as at Gournia, the streets are stepped. The houses, as would naturally be expected in so far advanced a state of society, vary in size and appointments. While the smaller houses do not seem to possess any definite plan, but consist rather of a series of intercommunicating chambers, the larger houses, which certainly had two or more stories, to judge by the evidence of some faience plaques from Cnossus, have an elaborate plan. From the street one entered through a porch into a court along the side of which are a number of small rooms usually including a bathroom. In the centre of the house, to give light to the rooms on the ground floor, was a light-well surrounded by a verandah. There were staircases to lead to the upper floors, and wells and cisterns are sometimes found within the area of the house. Larger houses, such as those of Tylissos or Nirou Chani, are still more elaborate, though the general principles remain the same. Here, however, there seems a clear division of the ground floor at least into two parts, which have no intercommunication except from a court or the entrance passage, a range of store rooms and a series of living rooms. The entrances are remarkable for their insignificance; and the houses from outside must have made, as far as we can tell without a detailed knowledge of the façade of the upper stories, but a poor appearance. The corridors and staircases are planned naturally enough on a larger scale than those of the small town houses. One interesting development is found in connection with the light-well, which shows a tendency to develop into an apartment not unlike the megara of Mycenae and Tiryns, as, for instance, in Houses A and Γ at Tylissos and the Hall of Double-Axes at Cnossus, where from a light-well one enters a porch with two columns, and thence through an entrance with three pilasters into the hall itself.

Houses such as these just referred to stand midway between the ordinary better class houses of Palaikastro and the great palaces of Cnossus, Phaestus and Hagia Triada, and were possibly the residences of chiefs or similar important persons. At Cnossus, again, while several houses of the ordinary type described above have been found near the Palace, there are two more elaborate houses, known as the Royal Villa and the Little Palace, which may have been residences for high officials or cadets of the royal family. Both of these have remarkable features: the former has a basilica-like hall, a pillar room and a double staircase; the latter has a sunken area bordered by a balustrade carrying wooden columns, pillar basements, other chambers, and it contained some fine ritual vessels.

The palaces at Cnossus and Phaestus also show the same division between private living-rooms and official apartments, which naturally include the royal magazines. At Cnossus the part of the palace to the west of the central court is the official side, while that to the east was reserved for the domestic quarters. Here is the finely-proportioned grand staircase with five flights of broad easy treads, a rich series of halls and chambers, long corridors, bathrooms, latrines, a small shrine, an olive press and other workshops: in short, everything needed to make the residential part self-sufficient. The care with which the sanitary system is laid out deserves special attention. On the opposite side of the court there is a state entry with a broad flight of steps leading up to a large columnar hall possibly for grand ceremonies or official audiences. On the ground floor are long rows of magazines carefully planned to occupy as little space as possible, and intended to receive tithes or similar percentages paid in kind as state revenue. Facing the court lie the palace shrine and the throne room, and between them a stepped portico and staircase led to the upper stories. As in the private houses, the actual entrances to the palace at Cnossus seem small and undignified. The northern is a narrow passage of a fortified character; and the western, though well built and really imposing, is not grand enough to be in keeping with so magnificent a palace. The southern was probably the main entrance, where there are clear, but scanty, indications of a fine propylaeum with steps. This was similar to the grand entrance at Phaestus, where there is a spacious stepped theatral area larger than the corresponding area outside the northern entrance at Cnossus. From this a broad flight of steps leads through a wide columned porch into a light-court. Thence, however, there is no direct entrance to the great court, and the different sections of the palace are reached by corridors

leading off to the sides. This system of tortuous entrances—in their essence defensive—was probably adopted to confuse a stranger, who even without them could easily lose his way in these truly labyrinthine buildings. At Phaestus the magazines and public rooms are grouped to the west of the central court and the domestic quarters to the north. All the details of the plans, in spite of the fact that no detailed plan in the modern sense seems to have been followed, show clearly that these palaces, houses and towns were those of a civilized race with a well-organized scheme of political and social life.

In addition, we have sufficient remains of the wall-paintings, which adorned the palaces, and they illustrate not only the art, but also the costumes and manners of the period. Of these the most artistic are without doubt the wonderfully naturalistic frescoes from Hagia Triada¹, representing women and animals against a charming floral landscape. The freshness and naturalism of this frieze are unrivalled in early art: the *chef d'œuvre* is a painting of a feline animal creeping stealthily through the undergrowth to spring upon an unsuspecting fowl. The cup-bearer from the processional frieze at Cnossus is a fine portrait of one of the race that produced this civilization. He wears silver rings on arms and neck, an engraved signet on his wrist, silver ornaments before his ears, and his robe is embroidered with a quatrefoil pattern. The hair is curly and dark, the figure is tall and slender, the complexion is dark, and the profile regular and refined. This is clearly not the portrait of some captive from overseas serving in the palace, but of some youth of noble birth honoured by his choice as a king's page. A later fresco of more summary style gives us the portrait of a girl of the same physical type. The frescoes illustrating the bull-baiting sports of the Minoan arena are animated and fresh in style. The miniature frescoes with pictures of shrines with a large gathering of ladies grouped under olive trees are somewhat rococo in treatment. But the naturalistic way in which the scene is handled deserves high praise, and the variety of gesture among these fashionably-dressed ladies attending some court ceremony is very noticeable. The style is more mannered than that of the fresco of 'Ladies in Blue,' which probably belongs to the end of the preceding age.

A wonderful blend of modelling and painting is represented by the high-reliefs in painted stucco which gave the artist full

¹ The newly found (1923) House of Frescoes at Cnossus shows more brilliant designs than even Hagia Triada, but there the colours have been ruined by fire.

opportunity to attempt the effects of light and shade by modelling, and at the same time the aesthetic richness of full colouring. Fragmentary though they are, these display a knowledge of anatomy far in advance of any contemporary art. Typical of this is a magnificent bull which shows a wonderful combination of power and delicacy in rendering. More magnificent, though in no way behind in modelling or style, is a relief of a Minoan prince wearing golden marks of rank, a chain round his neck, and on his head a crest with peacock feathers. A fine fragment from the port of Psaira, representing richly-dressed ladies, is noticeable for the delicate handling and the rich colouring and decoration.

Refinement and delicacy are equally the keynotes of Minoan art, and are well represented in the minor arts of gem-cutting, jewellery, ivory-carving and the like. Prominent in this sphere come the wonderful steatite vessels from Hagia Triada, the best of which shows a crowd of labourers marching with joyful songs to a harvest-home. The movement and life of the scene are admirable. Two other vases of the same material from the same site give scenes of athletic life quite as vivid, especially the boxers and a group of standing figures dignified and natural. The phantasy, especially in the Minotaur types, and the refined skill shown in the engraved gems and seal-stones, coupled with a close and sympathetic observation of nature, indicate the high pitch of culture to which Crete had attained, for many of these gems were used as private signets by prominent citizens and merchants. The gold and ivory Snake Goddess, now in Boston, and the ivory leaping youths from Cnossus show that the same qualities pervaded all branches of art. The slender forms and graceful movements of the latter executed with a sure, but light, touch endow them with vigorous life. Minoan marqueterie is well illustrated by the Royal Gaming Board, which is composed of ivory, crystal and blue paste inlays originally set on a wooden backing. Some of the crystal bars were backed with silver, others with blue paste and yet others were covered with thin gold leaf. These varied materials are most skilfully combined into an artistic whole and the elegant decorative scheme very delicately constructed. The result is magnificent.

Few objects in precious metals have been found for obvious reasons, but one or two small jewels hint that achievement here was as high. Bowls, jugs and other vessels of bronze display a more utilitarian spirit, but nevertheless are worked with the same care. We can see that by their graceful shapes and simple but harmonious decoration they are the products of craftsmen who

were artists. The same spirit is recognizable in the well-carved lamps, bowls and other objects of stone, which prove that the lapidaries of this age were also accustomed to combine art and utility. Nor was the potter behind his fellow-craftsmen, and it is perhaps in the pottery, which was naturally the commonest and the least costly of all household equipment, being used alike by prince and peasant, that we obtain the truest reflection of the artistic spirit of the period. With the advent of the first Late Minoan Period the light on dark technique that characterized the preceding period gives way by degrees to a dark on light technique.

At first naturalistic motives continue in the new medium, and the favourite designs of lilies, sprays of ivy, simple spirals and waving plants are arranged in zones round the bodies of the vases, which are very often imitated from originals in metal. In this period as much care was taken in painting large jars as in small and more refined vases. Great as was the demand for his wares the potter was still a craftsman and had not yet become a manufacturer. Consequently the shapes are elegant and the patterns well chosen and skilfully drawn with a fine feeling for design. In one respect only can the pottery of this time be criticized, the fabric is not as good as that of the less artistic productions of the succeeding period. The clay is not sufficiently well refined and is often insufficiently baked; in short, the mechanical or technical skill of the potter was not up to the standard of his art.

The costume of the day is excellently illustrated by the frescoes and similar representations of women and men. The ladies wear richly-embroidered bodices open in front with rather small waists, and long elaborate flounced skirts, a development of the costume fashionable in the Middle Minoan Period. It is clear that a dress of this type would easily lend itself to all the devices of the costumier's art. Compared to this the costume of the men is very simple. Although some figures are seen wearing thick cloaks, these must be regarded as overcoats for cold or wet weather. Otherwise the men's costume is limited to a loin-cloth covered with a short kilt. Both sexes wear jewellery, necklaces, earrings, and on the wrist an engraved seal-stone which seems to have been an essential part of Cretan costume. Persons of quality seem to have worn head-dresses like those of the prince in the high-relief of stucco described above. The swords and daggers carried by them are similar to the triangular-bladed weapons of the Middle Minoan Period, but are longer and more slender. Probably, too, the metal is of a better temper; but unfortunately in Crete only a few actual weapons of this period have been found.

Perhaps when an extensive cemetery of this date is excavated this gap in our knowledge will be filled. The principal cemetery of this time is that of jar-burials found at Pachyammos, and similar tombs of the same date have been found at Mochlos and Pseira, but no extensive cemetery with rich tombs belonging to this period, perhaps the climax of the Minoan civilization.

Yet another sign of the advanced character of Minoan culture from 1600 B.C. onwards is the development and frequent use of a linear script evolved from the pictographic signs of the preceding period. Writing was practised not merely on clay tablets, but also with ink on clay, and there are even indications that there were written documents of a perishable material. The elaborate organization of the Minoan system of administration, with the records of percentages paid, inventories of stores, and the like, points to a strong central government, which at this time certainly had its seat at Cnossus. Of the actual inner administration of the island we have no hint and can have none till the documents can be read; for, in addition to the tablets with accounts, there are other longer documents which suggest reports or despatches from local governors or representatives abroad. The absolute supremacy of Cnossus at this time seems clear, but we cannot yet say whether the Lord of Cnossus was *primus inter pares* or an absolute monarch like the contemporary rulers of Egypt: the latter view seems more probable when we take into consideration the later legends about the power of Minos. Beyond the shores of Crete the power and influence of its sovereigns stretched far. The Cyclades, and, in particular, Melos and Thera, the two nearest to Crete, were dependencies, in all probability, of their larger neighbour. On the mainland of Greece, especially in Argolis and Boeotia, the Minoan civilization had taken firm hold, but we cannot yet say whether this was due to peaceful penetration by settlement and intensive trade or the result of conquest and colonization. It is certain that the culture of the mainland about the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C. became overwhelmingly Minoan in character. Many of the objects found at Mycenae and other sites must be the handiwork of Cretan craftsmen, whether made in Crete or on the mainland. It has been suggested that this was brought about by piratical raids of prehistoric Vikings from the mainland of Greece against Crete, in which treasures of various kinds would have been brought home, as well as skilled craftsmen who worked, for instance, at Mycenae, as slaves for foreign masters. Another view is that Minoan dynasts actually occupied the throne of Mycenae. To these conflicting views we shall return below, but it is clear

that, whatever the cause, the Minoan civilization was dominant in the southern parts of the mainland.

Whether Crete had or had not relations with Rhodes, southwestern and southern Asia Minor, cannot as yet be determined; but when the systematic exploration of these regions can be undertaken it is probable that Minoan objects will be found in these areas. There was also, in all likelihood, direct connection with Cyprus, although clear evidence of this is as yet lacking. As to Egypt, we have ample evidence of contact between the Minoan civilization and the Nile valley, for many vases dating from this period have been found in Egypt, though we cannot be certain how many of them are really of Cretan origin. Some at least of the vases seem to be of mainland fabric, though of Minoan style, and therefore point rather to contact between the rising power of Mycenae and Egypt. Further, in Egypt, in tombs and inscriptions of the early XVIIIth Dynasty there is frequent mention of the people of Keftiu, who are often classed with the peoples from the islands in the midst of the sea (p. 277). The princes of these people come in peace and give presents to Rekhmire, Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Egypt under Thutmose III (pp. 278, 414). These mentions of the people of Keftiu and the appearance of their offerings has led many to identify them generally with the people who held the Minoan culture, especially since the discoveries in Crete have revealed to us its remote origins and splendid fullness. The representations of the Keftians correspond on the whole fairly well with Cretan frescoes such as the cup-bearer mentioned above. The Cretans from the earliest times clearly traded direct with Egypt, but it is possible that later they also used the longer route by way of the south-west and southern coasts of Asia Minor and thence sailed by way of Cyprus to Egypt. Thus the people of Keftiu might be any folk dwelling between Cilicia and Crete, and the appearance of Minoan objects among the presents of the princes of the Keftiu and of the islands in the midst of the sea would not be surprising, if the Cretans used the longer coasting route by way of Asia Minor and Cyprus to Egypt besides adventuring directly across the Libyan Sea. See further, pp. 278 sqq.

It is curious that, while there are Minoan objects in Egypt, no Egyptian objects of the early XVIIIth Dynasty have yet been found in Crete, although many rich deposits of the First Late Minoan Period have been excavated. At Zakro, for instance, in the extreme east of the island, which one would think would have been the first and last port in Crete for ships sailing direct to and

from Egypt, there was a most flourishing maritime settlement in the First Late Minoan Period, but only one Egyptian object was found during the excavations there. It is, of course, possible that Zakro was a port, not for trade with Egypt, but for trade on the coastwise route *via* the Southern Sporades, Asia Minor and Cyprus to the Nile. If Palaikastro was the final port for ships for the north coast of Crete, then Zakro might have occupied a similar place for the south coast. One thing seems certain at this time: the connections of Crete were with the islands and the north, with Asia Minor and the east, and with Egypt in the south. There seems to have been hardly any trade westwards at all and indeed, although west Crete is still not well explored, no remains of this period have been found there.

II. CRETE: LATE MINOAN II

In the Second Late Minoan Period the development of Cretan civilization continues, and, although it begins to show signs of internal weakness, it contains no hint that the Minoan empire was to be so totally and suddenly overthrown and eclipsed. At the end of this period, about the beginning of the fifteenth century B.C., the life in the palaces and towns still continued as before, and there is no break between the two periods. The gradual evolution of culture progressed as before. Cnossus, Phaestus, Hagia Triada, Palaikastro, and most of the other town sites continued their busy life. Except in detail it is impossible to mark off any particular building as typical of this period, for there is no difference in the architecture. The same style, the same methods were still in use, and the changes that took place at Cnossus, for instance, may best be described as alterations and repairs. There some rooms were being redecorated when the destruction fell on the palace. There are, however, hints that a setback at least might have been foretold, since at certain sites in east Crete, Gournia for example, there is no Second Late Minoan Period: this town seems to have been overthrown earlier than Palaikastro. Perhaps some earlier disturbance, the forerunner of the great catastrophe, had caused some damage before it was quieted. It has often happened that the earliest raids of an invader have been repulsed, and, if the overthrow of the Minoan power came about through an invasion from overseas, the first wave of the invaders may well have been driven back, but not before it had done some harm.

The art of the period is a natural development of that of the

preceding generation; but it must be confessed that its strength begins to decline. The earlier art had a reserve, a freshness, an eye for fine detail, which in the period now under consideration gives way to broader designs executed freely and with a grand carelessness. The marine motives of octopuses, shell-fish, dolphins and the like, which are one of the marked characteristics of the last period, are still in use, but in a degenerate form. The patterns are no longer reserved in zones or restrained within natural limits; but all patterns—cuttle-fish, lilies and other naturalistic motives—run riot over the surface of the vase in the grand manner of incipient baroque. The tendency is particularly noticeable in the large vases of the Palace style, and in some frescoes with designs of waving plants, which were actually in course of execution when disaster overtook Cnossus. The same treatment is visible also in the Griffin fresco of the Throne Room.

In gem-cutting and the minor arts this is expressed by a kind of artistic shorthand; for example, the artist, anxious to give free rein to his fancy, abbreviates certain essential details, for instance, the heads of human figures. Heraldic designs, which begin towards the end of the preceding period, are specially favoured in this period; and in this as in other minor arts, such as jewellery, the old tradition is well maintained. Vessels of stone, whether lamps or vases of different shapes, were very popular, and continued to be produced with all the old skill. But the baroque tendency noted above begins to create a certain formalism and patterns tend to become stereotyped and academic. This is to be remarked in the use of architectural composition, in the designs of the big jars of the so-called Palace style, with decoration of waving plants or squirming marine animals. A fine, but typical instance of this conventionality is to be seen in the splendid steatite rhyton in the form of a bull's head from the Little Palace at Cnossus. This, for all its delicate naturalism, betrays a schematic regularity in the arrangement and rendering of the hair and colour patches, and shows that artistic canons were already coming into force. The head of a lioness in white limestone, also from Cnossus, though less perfect, illustrates the same supreme skill in handling materials, but is no less academic in treatment.

The tombs of this period are represented by some shaft graves and pit caves in the Zafer Papoura cemetery, especially the Chieftain's Grave, which yielded a fine series of bronze swords, pans and ewers. Another type of tomb is the Chamber Tomb, an artificial sepulchral cave hollowed out of a sloping hillside with an open entrance passage. Tombs of this type have been found at

Isopata near Cnossus and at Phaestus; and at the former site there is a fine built tomb with a rectangular chamber of ashlar work roofed with a barrel vault and entered through a square-built ante-chamber from an open passage cut in the soft rock. This latter tomb was very rich, though plundered; and had probably served as a royal tomb. Prominent among its contents was a fine series of vases of Egyptian alabaster of XVIIIth Dynasty shapes, and some excellent specimens of large Minoan vases of the Palace style so characteristic of this period. As was said before, no sharp definition is possible between the First and Second Late Minoan Period; one blends into the other so gradually that no line of demarcation can be drawn. The Second Period is the natural evolution of the First, and one continuous and harmonious natural development pervades both. This is particularly noticeable with the weapon types, for instance the swords of the Chieftain's Grave, taken in conjunction with one from Phaestus, represent an advance on a common type of the first period, best illustrated by the Shaft Graves at Mycenae. The only points of difference to be observed are that the blade is somewhat longer and the angles of the hilt more emphasized.

III. THE FALL OF CRETE: LATE MINOAN III

The picture we thus obtain of Crete during the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. is one of a rich and powerful state, with oversea dominions controlled by a strong navy, and enjoying at home all the blessings of peace and a well-advanced and luxurious civilization. The streets and houses of the towns, the sumptuous appointments of the palaces, apparently unprotected by fortifications, testify to the peace, wealth and comfortable social condition of the people. The ruins of Cnossus and Phaestus declare that mighty rulers had dwelt there. These rulers were no mere petty tyrants; the clay tablets and the long rows of magazines show that the kings of Crete were the heads of an elaborate administration, civil and financial. The prosperity of the various towns, in particular the harbours, proves that social and commercial life flourished and grew rich under the aegis of some powerful monarch. This at once calls to mind the tradition that Minos, whose reign can hardly be placed before the fourteenth century B.C., had put down the pirates of the Aegean with a strong hand. In return for this protection would have been exacted taxes, which, if paid in kind, would have filled the great store jars in the magazines of Cnossus, and at the same time provided the where-

withal for the magnificence in dress, sports, and all household matters which are so well illustrated by the frescoes and the relics found at Cnossus, Phaestus and Hagia Triada.

We would gladly know more of this kingdom, of its organization, of the source and extent of its power, of its internal history other than that which we can read in its remains. That a strong dynasty ruled Crete in those days there is no doubt, and there must have been a succession of able rulers comparable to those of the XVIIIth Dynasty in Egypt. This goes without saying, and they must have been served by capable and well-trained ministers, captains and other officials, and ruled over a people industrious, enterprising and intelligent. But the mainspring of their power still remains a mystery. Was it the innate qualities of the Minoan people? Was it military prowess and success? Were their riches due to war or trade? Crete seems too small an island to have sent forth large armies, and as for trade what was the natural product that gave the island so great an advantage? Can olive-oil alone have sufficed or was Crete one of the copper-producing countries of the Near East in ancient times? There are copper mines in Crete of considerable antiquity, but it is not known if they were worked in Minoan times. Purple fish could be another source of wealth; but, so far as we can tell at present, Crete is not so surpassingly rich in any one natural product that that alone would have sufficed as the foundation of her greatness. The geographical position of the island and the skill of its inhabitants as seafarers may have been another factor. This, coupled with quickness of mind in trade and war (qualities which the modern Cretans display) under the wise leadership of a strong race of rulers, may have carried Crete to so high a pitch of power and culture. More we cannot know. More will one day be known when the riddle of the Minoan script is solved; and any day the excavator's pick may reveal new remains of this civilization, which will give an entirely new aspect to its history.

If the rise and origin of the Minoan power are obscure, the manner of its fall is obscurer still. We know no more than the ruins and the relics they hid have told us, that about the end of the fifteenth century B.C. Cnossus, and all the other towns and seats of power and civilization in Crete were destroyed. The palace at Cnossus went up in flames and its riches were plundered, and this fate befell the whole of central and eastern Crete. So universal a ruin cannot have been accidental: human and not natural agency must have brought it about. So thorough was the havoc wrought, that we can only imagine it to have been caused

by the invasion of an external enemy. Whence the enemy came no one knows. Asia Minor, Egypt and the northern islands hardly seem possible sources in the present state of our knowledge. On the other hand, the story of Theseus, though of course referring to later times, suggests that the people of the mainland, who had advanced extremely rapidly in civilization, since the first advent of the Minoan culture to their shores, driven to revolt by oppressive taxation, like the English of America, attacked, defeated and destroyed the Palace and the House of Minos. This is possible, for, before the fall of Cnossus, the mainland had in one or two points been reacting on Crete, and in the Third Late Minoan Period, which succeeds the great downfall of Minoan power, mainland types become more common in Crete. This might be only the natural concomitant of the supremacy of Mycenae; but it may mean more, that Crete was subject to her conqueror. If the conquerors settled in Crete they must have been of a similar race or at least one enjoying the same civilization; for, apart from the ruin of the towns and palaces, in the ensuing period there is no sign of any intrusive racial element. Some think that the treasures of the Shaft Graves of Mycenae were the loot won in piratical raids on Crete by the mainlanders; but this, as we shall see below, does not seem likely. In any case the probability that the conquerors were of the same culture as the conquered Cretans makes it again probable that the successful invaders came from the mainland.

The overthrow of the dominion of Crete was, however, only a political event and did not involve the suppression of its civilization, although it inevitably modified its evolution. In the Third Late Minoan Period just after the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C. we find that the same culture continued in Crete, and the ruined palaces and towns were again inhabited. There was a difference. The revival was only partial. At Cnossus only part of the palace was made habitable and occupied, and the same was the case at Hagia Triada. Town-sites, such as Palaiakastro, or Gournia, underwent the same experience. Though in all cases the same civilization continued, the people, who enjoyed it in Crete, were neither so strong nor so rich. Crete would still have counted as an important factor politically; Idomeneus, for instance, is one of the first-class heroes of the *Iliad*: but its wealth and its supremacy had passed to other lands.

Though the essential strength of Minoan art survived the disaster, and continued its development, yet, as might be expected, circumstances were not favourable for a further great

advance in culture. The art, therefore, of the Third Late Minoan Period is degenerate, and this is especially noticeable in the pottery. Here, in place of the carefully designed and well-executed motives of the earlier phases, we meet with stereotyped patterns often derived from naturalistic motives reduced by conventionality to decorative schemes. Yet, as pottery the ceramic wares of this period are superior to those of the preceding, though this is not so noticeable in Crete as on the mainland of Greece. To this point we shall return below. It is, however, often to be observed in the history of a people that an increase in technical skill is accompanied by a decrease in artistic quality. The quantities of the pottery of this age found prove that the island was still well-inhabited, and that after the disaster its social and commercial life had been re-established. Architecture now calls for no remark, since the Cretans in the main contented themselves with repairing the ruined dwellings of the preceding age; neither have we any wall paintings or written documents of the time. Perhaps with the passing of the advanced administration of the House of Minos there was no need to keep the elaborate accounts of earlier days; or perhaps some new, but, unfortunately for us, perishable material was used as more convenient than clay for writing upon. The tombs of Cnossus and Phaestus have yielded many objects, engraved gems, carved ivory, delicate pieces of jewellery and other minor objects, which prove that it is a mistake to despise this period, as many often do. Naturally, after the great days of the Middle Minoan and the first two phases of the Late Minoan Period, this concluding age is little better than an anticlimax; but civilization still flourished and still progressed in Crete.

The chances of excavation have given us, as regards certain aspects of Cretan culture, more evidence for this period than for its greater predecessors. The religious tradition was still the same, for instance, and the use of great cave shrines, like the Dictæan cave, continued unbroken. Little shrines found at Gournia and Cnossus, with a large part of their equipment still *in situ*, and similar finds at Koumasa and Hagia Triada, complete the picture. There was a shallow porch giving entrance to a small rectangular chamber. In the centre stood an altar or table of offerings with three legs, and made of painted stucco on a clay backing. Against the back wall was a low bench on which stood two pairs of horns of consecration, also of stucco, with a clay core, and, between the two horns, a hole for the insertion of a double-axe probably in bronze. With these, also, on the bench

around the horns of consecration were placed terra-cotta statuettes of male and female divinities, as a rule the latter. The male figures are full-length standing figures; the female figures are half-length figures set on large round bases from the waist downwards (these bases may of course be skirts), and very often have both hands upraised in an attitude of adoration. In the fore part of the chamber were large vases placed there as offerings, and round the table of offerings innumerable small votive cups and jugs of plain ware. Small votive double-axes and male and female figurines with doves indicate once again the important part played by these two symbols in the cult of the great Mother Goddess.

• Many tombs of this period have been found at Cnossus and Phaestus, and in many other places. At Cnossus shaft graves and pit caves are still in use; but everywhere the most usual type of tomb is the rectangular sepulchre hollowed out in the sloping hill-side with a narrow unroofed entrance passage cut horizontally through the rock. The bodies were often laid on the floor of the chamber and the funeral offerings arranged round it. Sometimes the burial would be made in a shallow pit cut in the floor of the tomb chamber, but the most usual form of burial was to place the body in a clay coffin, which often rests on four very short legs, has a pyramidal lid, and is rather deep, but not very long. Such clay coffins are first met with in the Early Minoan Period, but their use apparently did not become common till the very end of the Minoan culture.

Some of the coffins are well painted with various conventional designs: one of the best, from Palaikastro, is ornamented with representations of the double-axe, a winged griffin, birds and fish. Of the same general type, but totally different in technique, is the magnificent painted larnax or sarcophagus from Hagia Triada. This is made of soft limestone, and covered over with stucco on which important religious scenes are painted. On one long side are votaries bringing bulls to a male deity, who stands outside the door of his shrine, while at the same time women accompanied by a lyre player make libations before two double-axes erected on high stands. On each double-axe a sacred dove is perched. On the other side is seen the sacrifice of a bull before an altar. As the animal's throat is cut the blood flows into a vase. A flute player accompanies the rite, and again by the altar is seen a double-axe erected on a tall pillar with a sacred dove perched on it. The scenes at the ends represent persons, perhaps deities, driving in chariots. All the pictures are bordered by elaborate scroll patterns. This is the only fresco of definite Late Minoan III

date that has yet been found in Crete, but its value is greatly increased by its forming the decoration of a larnax and by the religious ceremonies depicted. Many of the clay larnakes are decorated with sunken panels, which suggest that these clay coffins are copies of similar larnakes made originally in wood with metal bindings.

Though, as a rule, the tomb-chamber is cut simply out of the rock, often it is lined with stone-work built up to form a kind of dome, either because the rock-roof was too soft to stand without support, or else in imitation of the big tombs of Mycenae. Small domed tombs of this type are common in Crete, but the construction is in no case elaborate. The use of them survives well into the succeeding period of transition between the latest Minoan and the earliest true 'Geometric' period. It is also worth noting that the shepherds of Mount Ida to-day build for themselves small huts of stone slabs in the form of primitive domes.

Among the objects found in the tombs one or two appear for the first time and indicate that in spite of its artistic decadence some advance in culture was made. The first to be noted are the broad bronze razors with sloping blades and a curved tang. There is of course no definite proof that these bronze implements were used as razors; but from their shape they are extremely well adapted for the purpose, being closely akin to the steel razor of to-day. In the later tombs of the time occur simple bronze fibulae or safety-pins, which afterwards became typical of the early Iron Age. No actual implements of iron have been discovered in any Minoan context, but in one or two cases small pieces of iron used as jewellery have been found. They seem to point to the fact that iron was known as early as the Second Late Minoan Period, but was so rare that it was used as a precious metal.

There was thus, even during the Third Late Minoan Period, a continuous development of civilization in Crete, notwithstanding the unfavourable circumstances already mentioned. The island dynasties had lost their political and military power, and consequently their wealth had decreased; but there was no break in the progress of culture. The palaces of Knossos and Hagia Triada were inhabited, the towns of Gournia and Palaikastro flourished; and from the cemeteries of Phaestus, Knossos and many another site we have seen that the Cretans of this period were well supplied with all the necessities of life and very many of the luxuries. The lower date of the Third Late Minoan Period, which at the same time marks the end of the Bronze Age, is not easy to fix. It certainly lasted to the end of the XXth

Dynasty in Egypt; because there are clear connections between the Egypt of Ramses III and the Minoan world, and this would bring the earliest date for its end to the middle of the XXth Dynasty, twelfth century B.C., or, if we follow the traditional dating, some thirty years after the fall of Troy, and some forty or fifty years before the Dorian invasion. At Vrokastro in east Crete, near Gournia, a very interesting settlement has been explored. Here in one of the tombs, with pottery of the transitional style between the latest Late Minoan III and the earliest Geometric, or full Iron Age pottery, six faïence seals were found, which can be assigned to the period covered by the XXth, XXIst and XXIInd Dynasties, 1205-745 B.C. If we take the middle date, in view of the character of the pottery, which is not of the fully developed geometric style, we should obtain the eleventh century and perhaps the first half of the tenth century B.C. as the period during which this transitional style was evolving. This then—it is, of course, largely conjecture—would set the end of the Bronze Age or Minoan Period at the close of the twelfth century B.C. This dating agrees, as we shall see below, with the results to be obtained from an examination of the evidence on the mainland. There is no sharp break between what we can call Minoan and Geometric pottery, the one representing the dying Bronze Age and the other marking the beginning of the Iron Age. There is, however, a slow change of style and character, which appears to have taken place under the gradual infiltration of a new factor. What the new factor was and whence it came we do not know, but it almost certainly was connected with the movement known to the Greeks as the Dorian Invasion. This was no sudden overwhelming conquest, but a slow process extending over many decades. See chap. XIX.

The beginning of the Iron Age was apparently a period of disturbance caused by the migration of peoples, but, as we observed in speaking of the beginning of the Bronze Age on the mainland of Greece, an improvement in mechanical methods is often accompanied by a decline in artistic expression. In this same period of transition the practice of cremation seems to have been introduced instead of the ordinary inhumation of the Bronze Age, and this should probably be assigned to the new element. Some have assumed that this new element was Achaean, and have postulated an Achaean conquest of Greece; but there is no reason to postulate an Achaean conquest, and in any case the archaeological evidence would bring the Achaeans into the field too late to have taken part in the siege of Troy.

The civilization of Crete continued to develop throughout parallel with that of the rest of Greece; but from the end of its great age, about the close of the fourteenth century B.C., Crete may almost be said to have had no history. The explorers of Crete have not unnaturally despised the Third Late Minoan Period as an anticlimax after the brilliance of the preceding epoch; but careful excavations, like those of Vrokastro just mentioned, are most valuable and should be undertaken not from the artistic point of view, but to throw light on the history of a people and its culture. At present these times, which include the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age, are wrapped in a thick mist where we have no light to guide us in our speculations.

IV. THE CYCLADES

At the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C. the Cyclades were apparently entirely under the domination of Crete; but, at the same time, they were obviously in close connection with the mainland as well. About the same time that the Second Palace of Knossos came into being, not long before the end of the Third Middle Minoan Period, the third settlement at Phylakopi in Melos was built, and it is from the results of the excavations of Phylakopi that we have derived a sequence of archaeological remains which give us a framework for the history of the period. Such evidence as is forthcoming from Thera, Paros and other islands, all confirms that derived from Melos. The development of civilization in the islands was continuous, because pottery like that of the latest floor deposits of the Second City at Phylakopi is equally characteristic of the early phase of the Third City. Prominent among this is pottery decorated with birds in a bichrome style, almost certainly descended from the Middle Minoan wares of Crete; and Melian vases of this class have been found in the Temple Repositories at Knossos, which date from about 1600 B.C.

Cretan pottery is also found to have been imported to Melos and Thera at this time; but, as might be expected, since these islands stand midway between Crete and the mainland, pottery from the latter region also occurs, though perhaps not so plentifully. The famous fresco of the flying fish found in the ruins of the principal house or palace at Phylakopi, with its delicate colouring and graphic observation of nature in the graceful movements of the fish, seems to be the work of a Cretan artist,

who probably was summoned to Melos for the purpose. This particular fresco is not the only wall painting of this date and style found in Melos, for there are many other fragments which, stylistically, can be grouped with the paintings typical of the first phase of the later palace at Cnossus, or, in other words, can be placed in the early sixteenth century B.C. These and the imitations of the contemporary Cretan vases made by the native potters of Melos, with their inferior clay and pigments, together with various small finds of bronze, ivory, stone and the like, show that the culture of the islands at this time was practically a colonial edition of the Minoan. The same is true of the next phase (Late Cycladic II); but now the influence of the mainland begins to be stronger. There are more importations of pottery from the mainland than from Crete; and in this fact is reflected the coming of the change, when, at the close of the fifteenth century B.C., the main centre of culture and of political power was shifted from Cnossus to Mycenae. The native pottery, too, though copying Cretan or mainland types and designs, is more formal, and the potters have lost the delight in nature, especially plants and flowers so characteristic of the Melian wares at the end of Middle Cycladic III and the beginning of Late Cycladic I. The quality of the imported wares is not so good, and they had little influence on the native ware. This is thought to be due to a decline in the wealth and trade of Melos; since, as the Bronze Age ripened, and the use of metal became commoner, there would be less demand for the obsidian implements of Melos. This is certainly a factor which might affect Melos, but it would have less or hardly any effect on the other Cyclades. The causes of decline must be looked for elsewhere.

In the third phase of this age (Late Cycladic III) the imports from Crete stop completely, and Melos and the other islands now import pottery from the mainland almost exclusively. In other words, Mycenae has replaced Cnossus as the suzerain of the islands. The Mycenaean vases and other objects now found in the islands are those typical of the period, which is marked by the greatest diffusion of Mycenaean culture. The main feature of the Mycenaean pottery now imported into the islands is its good fabric; as pottery it is excellent, and it is only aesthetically degenerate. The earliest imported ware is artistically excellent, but from the point of view of fabric poor. These facts, coupled with the wide diffusion of Mycenaean products that occurred at this time, suggest that the artistic decline, for that is what the decline of Melos amounts to, was due to other causes;

but to this we shall return below in discussing the culture of the mainland.

Another point which shows the influence of the mainland on the islands is the existence in Melos of a 'palace' which has a 'megaron' of a distinctly mainland type. This megaron belongs to the later phases of the third city and has court, a porch and a central hearth. It is, in fact, a small reproduction of the megaron of Mycenae and Tiryns, and in plan recalls some of the private houses of Mycenae which belong to the Third Late Helladic Period. The presence of a few Cypriote potsherds in deposits of this same period at Phylakopi shows how far Melian trade connections could extend.


Towards the end of the Third Late Cycladic period indications of the transition from Mycenaean to early geometric pottery are to be observed. Melos, Paros, and Thera, in particular, are the islands where such traces have been found, up to the present; but it is highly probable that, if exploration were extended over all the Cyclades, similar finds would result. What has been found shows that, as in Crete, so in the other islands, there is no sharp break between the end of the Bronze and the beginning of the Iron Age. The one gradually shades off into the other and no boundary between the two can be drawn. At the same time, a new or foreign element is to be observed, and this was one of the factors in the change. So little is as yet known of this age of transition—there is only the evidence of the limited amount of pottery so far discovered—that one cannot say more at present than that the change is due to a gradual transformation brought about by the new element working on the old tradition of the island culture, which had already become formalized. It is best, in any case, to defer a general discussion of the transition till we have considered the contemporary history of the mainland.

V. THE GREEK MAINLAND: MYCENAE

At the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C. a strong dynasty of kings, which we may call the Shaft Grave Dynasty, ruled Mycenae, and the relics found in their graves give us the best picture of the culture of the period (First Late Helladic). Of actual architectural remains of this date but little has been found; at Mycenae beneath the floors of the later palace many fragments of painted stucco, broken pottery, unconnected walls and other débris alone indicate the existence of an earlier palace where the kings of the Shaft Grave Dynasty lived. This palace was probably

PLAN OF THE PALACE
AT CNOSSUS (see p 433)


- 1 Long Gallery
- 2 Court of the Altar
- 3 South Propylaeum
- 12 Central Court
- 14 Throne Room
- 16 Room of the Olive press
- 18 North-east Hall
- 22 Grand Staircase
- 23 Hall of Colonnades
- 24 Hall of Double Axes
- 25 Queen's Megaron
- 26 Bathrooms



PLAN OF THE PALACE AT CNOSSUS


PLAN OF THE PALACE
AT TIRYN'S (see p 450 ff)

- AA Outer courts
BP' Courts
C Larger megaron with central hearth (heria)
C' Smaller megaron



THE PALACE AT TIRYN'S

PLAN OF MYCENAE (see
pp 450 ff, 457 ff)



PLAN OF MYCENAE

fortified, but owing to the great rebuilding that took place at Mycenae about the beginning of the fourteenth century no traces of the walls have been identified. At Tiryns there was a small fortified citadel; the gateway and the general line of the walls are quite clear, but of other buildings there is no trace save fragments of wall paintings. There are, of course, at both sites other remains, such as broken pottery, and bones of sheep, pigs, oxen and so forth, and quantities of oyster shells, showing what were favourite dishes. At Thebes some unintelligible walls and quantities of fresco fragments indicate that it was an important centre, and some vases and other relics from tombs have also been found there. The town site of Korakou near Lechaëum, with its excellent stratification, and tombs at Chalcis, also give valuable details; and many less important finds have been made in central Greece and the Morea, and one or two in Thessaly. No house or town plans as yet have been made out; the fragments of fresco are the only remains of the houses or their decorations.

The Theban fragments come from a frieze of women elaborately dressed with flowing flounced skirts, tight waists and open bosoms, who carry in one hand a small vase and in the other a small bunch of flowers. They wear necklaces and are most elaborately coiffured. From Mycenae there are fragments of a scene showing men with horses and chariots from the Palace, and from the Ramp House many miscellaneous pieces. Among the latter the most prominent is one showing ladies looking out of the window of a palace or a sanctuary which has double-axes inserted in the upper angles of the window frames. There are other pieces showing scenes of bull-baiting, or acrobatic performances, similar to the miniature frescoes of Cnossus. From Tiryns come among many other fragments those of a procession of huntsmen. These frescoes of course depend directly on the Cretan masterpieces, to which they are in no way inferior. The main question is: are the frescoes the productions of Cretan artists who came over to work for the princes of the mainland, or of mainland artists trained in the Cretan tradition? It is probable that, at first, when the Minoan civilization began to establish itself on the mainland, Cretan artists and craftsmen, such as potters, metal workers and lapidaries, came over. Later, probably before the end of the sixteenth century, the Minoan civilization was so well established on the mainland that the native artists and craftsmen had learned the Minoan technique and were employing it in their own way. This process is well reflected in the pottery where the subordinate native element began to influence more and more the imported

Cretan style, and thus produced mainland or Mycenaean art as distinguished from Minoan. However, for the sake of uniformity, this period is called Late Helladic; but this of course refers to the provenance of the objects, and not to the origin of the art they represent. As remarked before, to describe this period properly we should call it Mino-Helladic, or some similar clumsy name.

The Shaft Graves of Mycenae, wherein lay nineteen members of a royal family, have provided us with perhaps the very richest amount of material for assessing the culture of a prehistoric period. The Sixth Shaft Grave is the oldest and falls at the very end of the Middle Helladic Period (vol. 1, p. 608). It contained two bodies, an earlier and a later interment. The pottery in this grave with two or three exceptions is characteristic of the Second Middle Helladic Period and shows no direct Cretan influence. Two vases are of the First Late Helladic style, but in all probability of mainland manufacture. In this connection one should reflect that it is far easier to import a potter than to import pots; and if one assumes that the Late Helladic pottery found on the mainland was all imported from Crete, then the mainland would have made practically no pottery at all at this time, which seems inconceivable. There is only one small gold cup with very thin walls which may be Minoan, and the spear and daggers are of ordinary Bronze Age types. We thus see here the beginning of the influence of Crete on the culture of the mainland.

Next in order of date probably comes the Second Shaft Grave which contained only one skeleton, one gold cup like that of the sixth grave, a gold diadem and a few vases. The two richest graves were the fourth, which contained five, and the fifth, which contained three, bodies respectively. Their faces were covered with gold masks, and they wore gold diadems and breastplates, gold bracelets and gold signets, and their grave clothes had been decorated with all kinds of ornaments of thin gold plate. By their sides lay long swords heavily ornamented with gold, many gold cups and silver cups of various shapes. Special treasures were the silver rhyton in the form of an ox head, another of gold in the shape of a lion's head, and a long funnel-shaped rhyton in silver, decorated with a delicately and minutely engraved siege-scene—a contemporary document of the highest value. It possibly represents the repulse of a raid made by pirates on some Mycenaean stronghold near the sea, like Tiryns. There were beads of amber and amethyst, showing that the trade connections of these kings stretched into the amber-producing regions of the north and to Egypt in the south. Alabaster vases, gigantic cauldrons and other

vessels of copper, ostrich eggs adapted for use as libation vessels, and ornaments of faïence and ivory, all form only a small part of the treasures of these tombs. There were also parts of the faïence and crystal inlay of a gaming-board like that found at Cnossus.

Perhaps the most marvellous objects, which illustrate at the same time the delicate skill of Mycenaean craftsmen and their artistic instinct, are the bronze daggers inlaid with hunting-scenes in gold. On one we see three magnificent lions galloping away *ventre à terre*. On another, one side shows lions pulling down fallow-deer, and the other a band of huntsmen attacking lions. A third has a scene of a cheetah or some tamed feline animal chasing ducks in a swamp. It is hard to know what to admire most, the eye which designed these naturalistic scenes, or the hand which executed them with sure, but delicate skill. The third grave had contained three bodies, one of which was that of a queen, and by her side had been laid her infant child wrapped in thin sheets of gold. She had gold necklaces and other ornaments, including a set of four small toilet vessels of gold. The bodies wore gold diadems, gold and crystal pins, gold beads engraved in intaglio and many other precious ornaments. The grave clothes, as in the other tombs, had been decorated with disks of gold embossed with various designs.

The latest of the graves is most probably the first; it also contained three skeletons. The treasures of this grave were similar to the others, but were less rich on the whole. The six graves, to which should probably be added another recently found outside the grave circle itself a little to the north, contained nineteen or twenty bodies. We cannot suppose that these were all kings or queens; some allowance must be made for the possibility that other members of the royal house were laid to rest here beside the kings themselves. This dynasty ruled Mycenae for about a century, and with Mycenae presumably held supremacy over the islands and most of continental Greece. Then Mycenae was a small citadel confined to the fortified palace on the summit of the Acropolis, and the cemetery where the kings were buried was a bare sloping hillside well outside any fortifications, and as yet unoccupied by the Lion Gate or any other mighty monuments. Mycenae and its territory in themselves produced no sort of wealth and had no innate source of power, which would naturally make its rulers superior to their neighbours. Whatever the source of its greatness, military prowess, natural wealth or control of trade, Mycenae became by selection and fortification the firm central seat of the power that soon dominated Greece and the

Aegean. It is an open question whether this Shaft Grave Dynasty was a Minoan family, which, like some Norman baron of later days, had won the leadership of the less civilized peoples of the mainland, or whether it was a local dynasty which held and increased its power by the strength of its own right arm and the plunder of Crete. The overwhelmingly Minoan character of the civilization represented by the objects found in the Shaft Graves speaks for the former view; while the marked Helladic character of the pottery of the two earliest graves speaks for the latter view.

In art, so far as can be judged by the pottery and other objects, the main tendency was a simple naturalistic form of decoration derived from a close observation of nature. The pottery technically is not good; the biscuit is often poor, and the paint, though of good quality, is not well burnt in. On the other hand, the design and decoration of the vases, since each vase was still a work of art to its maker, leave little to be desired in artistic expression.

During this period, the sixteenth century B.C., the Minoan civilization, which had begun to establish itself on the mainland toward the end of the seventeenth century, rapidly overran the more important regions. As stated before, it is impossible to say whether this was the result of a conquest or a colonization in force, or whether the artistic adaptability and the eager receptivity of the Helladic peoples brought about this absorption of the mainland into the sphere of the Minoan civilization—though it must always be remembered that the underlying Helladic element still subsisted, and in the times to come gradually won its way to the front again and translated the Minoan into the Mycenaean culture. Mycenae with its subordinate states in Argolis, such as Tiryns, with Corinth and other Peloponnesian areas, was obviously dominant in the south, and through Corinth and Thisbe had relations with Boeotia. We do not know, however, whether Boeotia acknowledged the overlordship of Mycenae; but, in any case, Orchomenus and Thebes were no insignificant cities, and the territory later owned by Chalcis and Eretria fell also within this sphere of influence. Trade too was already pushing up the Euripus towards the Malian Gulf and Iolcus. It is, of course, impossible at present to fix the limits of the influence of Mycenae and Thebes during this period, but it is probable that, during it, the foundations of the great Mycenaean confederacy, which if tradition be true subsequently undertook the expedition against Troy, were securely laid.

With the advent of the fifteenth century the Shaft Grave Dynasty is replaced on the throne of Mycenae by the Tholos

Tomb Dynasty. At least we know that the kings, who then ruled Mycenae, were buried not in Shaft Graves like their predecessors, but in large-built domed tombs. These tombs have all been plundered, and as no other buildings of this period have yet been excavated, we have less knowledge of it than of the preceding century. Tholos tombs of this type found throughout southern Greece indicate that the state of civilization was more settled, and that the supremacy of the Mycenaean system had spread. One of these tombs, that at Vaphio, a little to the south of Amyclae, was not completely plundered, and its contents give us a glimpse of the culture of the age. Amber and amethyst beads prove the continuance of the trade connections with the north and with Egypt, and a magnificent series of finely-engraved seal-stones show that the high tradition of artistic achievement was maintained and developed. This is also splendidly illustrated by the two embossed gold cups from this same tomb with amazingly spirited and natural scenes of the capture and taming of wild bulls. These cups, both from the supreme excellence of their craftsmanship and the living quality of the representations, are unexcelled in Mycenaean art, and many have claimed them as masterpieces from the hand of some Cretan Cellini. There are inlaid daggers, swords, axes and other weapons of bronze from the tomb, and with these a quantity of fragments of pottery. Many of the latter belong to large finely decorated amphorae of the so-called Palace style, which flourished at this time. The patterns lose the simplicity and restraint of the previous period, and now begin to spread all over the surface of the vase without control.

The actual fabric of the vases is better than that of the preceding century, but still not perfect. Though the designs are magnificent, and drawn quite freely, and guided merely by the eye of the artist, yet there is a strong baroque element to be observed. Art had broken through the bonds of naturalism and refinement and was seeking expression in size and luxuriance of design. Large vases of this type and style have been found in all the earlier tholos tombs at Mycenae and elsewhere, for instance at the Argive Heraeum, Kakovatos, Messenian Pylus, Thoricus, and Kapakli near Iolcus. This latter tomb and other finds in Thessaly show that this area had now been brought under the influence of the Mycenaean culture. Similarly, rich finds from tombs at Chalcis and Thebes show that the civilization was as much at home in Boeotia as at Mycenae itself. Here, private tombs of the age have been found, and the objects, especially the

pottery, found in them confirm the impression produced by the relics from the Vaphio tomb. The age was one of expansion: the quieter art and methods of the preceding century had given way to a restless spirit of expansion, which was striving more for trade and riches than for art, the peace which has no history. There was, consequently, a desire for extravagance as the outward and visible sign of the material prosperity, which was daily growing greater.

This spirit is well represented by the baroque character of the patterns of the large Palace-style vases, which typify the age, and by the imposing nature of the tholos tombs themselves. These are the only considerable remains of the architecture of the period; and if private houses, palaces and fortifications were built in the same manner they must have been advanced for the period. It must be admitted that to plan and build a domed tomb some twelve metres in diameter and as many in height is a considerable undertaking, even when provided with all the resources of the Iron Age; but for the experimental masons of the Bronze Age (not yet in its prime) it was a great achievement. Except for the great blocks, which formed the lintels, and some of the angle stones, none of the blocks employed are very large. All stone was hammer-dressed and the major part of the material used was very roughly shaped. In the earliest tholos tombs the stones are quite undressed. The walls of the dome are very thick and, since the walls gradually incline inwards towards the top, the walls are constructed with an elaborate system of wedging or counter-weighting. Naturally, experience showed how the building of such tombs could be improved; and the construction of the later tholoi, which may be dated to the end of the fifteenth century, is much better than that of those which are believed to be the earliest. If, then, we may characterize the sixteenth century as the period of settlement, the fifteenth is the age of expansion, and in the succeeding fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, the flower of the Mycenaean civilization opens wide, but, like many roses, its beauty was greater in the bud than when full blown.

VI. THE SUPREMACY OF MYCENAE

With the advent of the fourteenth century B.C. came the founding of Mycenae as we know it now. At the beginning of this century some great king arose who consolidated the wealth and power of the rising empire, so that Mycenae supplanted Cnossus, which declined and fell at this very time, and became the main focus of culture and dominion in Greece and the Aegean.

This great king rebuilt the palace and citadel of Mycenae, which was not merely a royal residence, but also the fortified central seat of government. Here within its walls were no doubt grouped the vizier, the captains of the host, the royal scribes and tax-gatherers, the royal bodyguard, with all the craftsmen and slaves necessary for the social life of the capital stronghold of the empire. Against the terrace summit of the acropolis rose a lofty and widespread palace with several stories, a spacious court, a grand staircase, noble halls and richly-appointed private apartments. From the roof of his palace the king's guards could survey the gulf and the plain of Argos, the trade-route leading north through the hill-passes to Corinth, and thence by Thisbe into Boeotia in the very heart of Greece. Towering above the citadel rose the high peak of Hagios Elias, and from the signal station thereon the watchmen could signal to Corinth, Mideia, Asine, and all the neighbouring strongholds, and at the same time watch the other main road into Argolis through the gorge which Mideia guards. On the slopes below the palace, but of course still within the walls, were the private houses of the royal officials, the store-houses for percentages paid in kind, and for supplies in case of siege. The whole was surrounded by gigantic cyclopean walls, some ten feet or more thick, built of huge blocks of stone.

The main gate, the Lion Gate, was faced with rectangular blocks of conglomerate, and above the gate still stands the famous slab carved in relief with two confronted lions supporting the central sacred pillar—the symbol of strength and the protection of Mycenae. Near the gate, and just to the right of the great road that climbs the hill to the palace, lies the double ring of slabs enclosing a level space to preserve for ever as a sacred area the tombs of the kings of the Shaft Grave Dynasty. On the ridge beyond, fronting the palace citadel, we can imagine—so similar is the construction—this same king built for himself and his family the domed tomb known to-day as the Treasury of Atreus, and one of the wonders of the world. This tomb and its entrance passage are built throughout of large rectangular blocks of conglomerate. Some of them are of enormous size; the inner lintel block is estimated to weigh about one hundred and ten tons. The entrance passage is twenty feet wide and one hundred and fifteen in length, and the door eighteen feet high and nearly nine feet wide. The great dome itself, still perfect after three thousand years and more, is fifty feet high and somewhat more in diameter. Off the main chamber is a side-chamber which seems to have

been used as a charnel house. The technical skill required to build so splendid a monument—when finished it was decorated with gold and bronze and ivory—was great indeed, but perhaps the imagination which conceived it, and the calculation which made it possible in the fourteenth century B.C., were even greater.

There are two other tombs at Mycenae built in the same style, one of which, the smaller, is still intact. These, though showing more advance in technical details, we might consider as the tombs of the kings who succeeded the king who refounded the city citadel. It seems likely that the kings of Mycenae, just like the pyramid-building kings of Egypt, built each for himself and his family one of these great tholos tombs, and that the later and degenerate kings, who were not wealthy enough to build one for themselves, made use of the tombs of their predecessors. One of the later kings added the north-east angle of the citadel, and built the vaulted way that leads down to the large subterranean secret cistern outside the walls, the sure supply of water in case of a siege. The ordinary population of Mycenae, craftsmen, farmers, merchants, and the like, doubtless lived in small townships and hamlets scattered about the country around the citadel. The population must have been fairly large, to judge by the extent of the cemeteries of Mycenae, and it is obvious that so strong a central power must have been based on a numerous population established round its principal seat.

Within the bounds of Argolis there were subordinate strongholds, such as Mideia, Asine and Hermione; but the most important was Tiryns. Here, close to the sea on a rocky knoll, which had been inhabited since the beginning of the Bronze Age, a small palace had been erected and fortified during the sixteenth century. Some time after the beginning of the fourteenth century—later, that is to say, than the building of the palace at Mycenae—a new and larger palace was built at Tiryns, with a strong gateway, a well-proportioned propylon, a paved court with colonnades, and a large hall or megaron elaborately appointed. There are store and other miscellaneous apartments, including a bathroom, the floor of which is made of one gigantic slab, and there was one upper storey at least. This palace was fortified with strong walls similar to those of Mycenae and in the latest additions—of the thirteenth century probably—vaulted galleries with store-chambers were constructed in the thickness of the walls. There was a lower citadel, which was not inhabited, but for use in case of need as a refuge for flocks, and herds, and the surrounding population.

All the details of these massive fortifications, the well-guarded gate, the postern entrance set in a strong bastion, and the tower-like projections show that the Mycenaean people were well versed in defensive warfare at least. On the plain all around the citadel lay the town of Tiryns, which was probably unfortified and perhaps lay open to raids by pirates, such as that depicted on the silver rhyton from Mycenae mentioned above. The road to Corinth lay in the hands of the ruler of Mycenae and Corinth itself was no doubt subject to him. There at Korakou not far east of Lechaëum was the northern port of Mycenae. Thence ships could trade westwards down the Corinthian gulf, or straight across to Thisbe, and so reach Boeotia with the rich domains of Thebes and Orchomenus.

Although the Peloponnese is only very imperfectly explored, enough has been found to show that it was completely dominated by the Mycenaean civilization. Attica and Aegina, too, fell within its sphere, and Boeotia with Euboea and Phocis was a very important centre. Here on the rocky island of Goulas in the Copais basin, itself drained by well-engineered dykes, are the walls of a great fortress, which still stand to a height of ten feet, are over twenty feet thick and have a circuit of three quarters of a mile. This is, as regards area, the largest Mycenaean citadel, and it has four gates, in contrast to the two of Mycenae. Against the north wall are the ruins of a large building identified as a palace, which has not yet been studied sufficiently; and there are traces of other houses. Both this stronghold and the ruined, but wonderful tholos tomb at Orchomenus, which has an elaborate carved ceiling in its side chamber, and challenges comparison with the Treasury of Atreus, belong to the same age (Late Helladic III), and show that Boeotia was almost as powerful as Mycenae. Thessaly, the Ionian Islands (except apparently Corcyra) and Aetolia were also parts of the Mycenaean dominion, which, as we have seen, extended over the Aegean islands, and perhaps held even Crete in tribute.

This was the great period of the widest diffusion of Mycenaean power and influence. Through traders or otherwise Mycenaean objects made their way to Sicily (see p. 570) and perhaps Spain (but see p. 590). Commerce with Egypt was frequent and reciprocal, especially from the time of Amenhotep III onwards¹. The western shores of Asia Minor, even, seem to have been

¹ The common occurrence of ivory, which will have come from an African source, in tombs of the Third Late Helladic Period, is one sign of the close relations between Mycenae and Egypt.

colonized in some degree by Mycenaeans, and Cyprus, to say nothing of the southern Sporades, was a seat of Mycenaean culture. Along the northern shore of the Aegean, Macedonia and Thrace, Mycenaean traders made their way; Troy came into touch with the culture and even in the far interior of Asia Minor stray shreds of Mycenaean pottery have been found. The coast of Palestine and perhaps Phoenicia fell under the spell of Mycenae and later during the great migrations, that harried Egypt under the Ramessid dynasty, folk who bore the Mycenaean culture were among the settlers in Philistia. The typical pottery of Philistia is a late and degenerate version of Mycenaean pottery and cannot be earlier than the twelfth century B.C.

Though the progressive character of the Mycenaean civilization had done much to advance civilization throughout the mainland of Greece and the Aegean basin to a uniform standard, yet one cannot imagine that it made so much progress in the outlying regions, in Thessaly, for instance, or central Aetolia, as in some of the islands and earlier settled districts of the mainland, Laconia, Argolis, Corinthia and Boeotia. In the border lands the ruder local culture would still have survived, although the inherent force of the civilization of the dominant power was gradually imposing on all within its sphere of influence a kind of cultural 'Koiné.'

Of the political relations and organization of the Mycenaean realm we know practically nothing till the later thirteenth century, for which Homer furnishes some information. All was under one overlord, the ruler of Mycenae, the head for the time being of the house of Atreus. The other princes and barons vary much in their relations to the central power; some, such as the Arcadians, seem to be his vassals; others, such as Nestor or Achilles, seem more or less his equals. We can imagine, perhaps, the Mycenaean Empire as a kind of loose federation, not unlike the Holy Roman Empire of later days, in which supreme power did not necessarily always repose in the hands of the same dynasty or state, just as at one time the Hohenstaufens held the empire, and at another the Hapsburgs.

Of the internal administration nothing can be known till written documents have been found—and of this there is good hope, for many inscribed vases with painted inscriptions have been found at Thebes and Tiryns—and not only found but read. Of the palaces we know something of their plans and arrangements, wide-spreading buildings of at least two stories grouped round a court with the lower structure of stone and the upper of crude

brick and wood. There were bathrooms, staircases and windows, and the frescoes, of which, especially at Tiryns, many fragments have survived, show that the decorations and appointments were even luxurious. The Tiryns frescoes, which show a frieze of elaborately-dressed ladies carrying carved ivory boxes, a boar-hunt rendered with great spirit, and a procession of men and women in chariots, as well as purely decorative but intricate patterns, give us, coupled with some carved ivories and engraved gems, the best pictures of Mycenaean costume. The women wore tight jackets with an open bosom, and full skirts very carefully flounced and gathered. They were fond of jewellery, bracelets, earrings and necklaces, and arranged their hair in very complicated coiffures. The men wore either the loin cloth and short kilt or sometimes a short-sleeved tunic. Of their armour we know more than of their dress. They wore greaves and breastplates in the latest Mycenaean age, and carried either small round shields, or large figure-of-eight shields, the latter probably made of ox hide. They wore plumed helmets of bronze, or leather helmets on which were sewn rows of boars' tusks. Offensive armament comprised long bronze swords for thrusting, short daggers, either for parrying or for fighting at close quarters, bows and arrows, and long spears. Other weapons include heavy double-axes and a kind of hanger or bill, though these may not necessarily have been used for war. Two-wheeled chariots were known and used both for war and the chase.

Apart from war, the great relaxation of Mycenaean princes seems to have been hunting, especially fallow-deer, wild boars, and birds such as wild duck and geese. It is even possible that lions yet lingered in some of the wilder parts of Greece. At all events, the Mycenaean people were quite familiar with the appearance of lions. Red-deer, too, still probably existed, for their antlers are not uncommonly found among the débris of Mycenaean settlements. Wolves, which even now frequent the hills behind Mycenae, must also have been hunted.

As in Crete, so generally on the mainland, the favourite sport, practised possibly at great festivals, was bull-baiting. Many representations of this are found in the Late Minoan I and II frescoes of Crete, and it is a common theme at Tiryns and Mycenae as well. Male and female acrobats took part in the sport, the object of which was to induce the bull to charge. Then one of the performers awaited the onrush, seized the horns of the bull, swung himself up by means of a somersault on to the animal's back and finally leapt down behind the bull, to be caught probably

in the arms of one of his comrades. This, which seems to have been a dangerous form of the much quieter bull-baiting still practised at Florence on St John's Day, must have required considerable acrobatic skill from the performers and presumably gave rise to the later legends of the Minotaur.

Travel must have been to some extent by chariot, where roads for wheeled traffic existed, and it seems that the lords of Mycenae paid special attention to the communications around their capital. The line of the roads was carefully laid out, and causeways and primitive bridges were erected over water-courses. Otherwise, travellers would have ridden and goods have been carried by pack-mule, as to-day in most parts of the Balkans. For overseas travel ships were used, though they need not have been large, but merely broad keelless sailing caïques of not much over fifty tons burden, not unlike those that sail the Aegean to-day. Such sailing vessels would not require large ports for shelter, and could if necessary be beached on sandy shores.

Fishing must have been known, as fish bones are found among house débris. The purple fish was an article of commerce. Lobsters, oysters, sea-urchins, scallops, and whelks were eaten, and fresh-water mussels and snails as well. Of other animals used for food, besides deer and wild boar, goats, sheep, oxen, hares and pigs seem to have been the most popular. Wheat and barley were known and cultivated, with several kinds of lentils, beans and peas; and wild vegetables, such as wild asparagus, wild onions, and others, which are popular to-day, were undoubtedly eaten. Of fruit, figs, grapes and the olive were the commonest and the most valuable; but others such as apples, pears, plums, almonds and chestnuts were most likely known. Milk and honey were natural products, which were cultivated, so that, on the whole, the ordinary Mycenaean could have had a well-varied diet.

Of the internal arrangement of the ordinary private house we know little, as few have yet been completely excavated. The general plan, however, seems to have been based on a light court with a series of apartments opening off it. There were usually two stories and in some cases basements as well. In restricted spaces, as within the walls of Mycenae, a small entrance porch seems to have replaced the court; but till several houses of this period have been excavated we cannot say more. The best specimens so far found—they come late rather than early in the Third Late Helladic Period are those at Korakou, the port on the Corinthian gulf. These have a small entrance porch with one

column *in antis*, one large room with a central hearth, and a sacred pillar standing beside it, and at the back a store-room. A larger house had two back rooms, and the central room was replaced by an open court with a central hearth and sacred pillar, and a kind of verandah running round. The roofs of the houses were in all probability flat, and used as sleeping apartments in warm weather and for drying grain and fruits.

When the art of writing was introduced into the mainland, probably from Crete, we do not know. At all events there is ample evidence that it was well known during the great days of Mycenae, Tiryns and Thebes in the Third Late Helladic Period. From the two latter sites come a large number of stirrup-jars with groups of signs painted on them, possibly to describe the contents. Unfortunately, as yet no documents similar to the archives of Cnossus engraved on clay tablets have come to light on the mainland. It is possible that by the Third Late Helladic Period it was the custom to write on some perishable material as a substitute for the earlier clay tablets; and, it is to be remarked that in Crete no documents of the Third Late Minoan Period have yet been found. Future excavations will no doubt help towards the solution of this problem.

We do not know what were the special objects of Mycenaean export trade. Certainly natural products, such as wine and oil, and minerals, such as copper or obsidian, must have been articles of commerce, and it also seems likely that pottery was a staple article of trade. In three basement rooms of a large Mycenaean house, excavated at the prehistoric site of Zygouries near Cleonae, a great number of unused pots of many types was found. This was apparently the principal house of the settlement, and its owner seems to have been a dealer in pottery. The vases—mostly drinking cups, plain casseroles, saucers and jars of various types for ordinary domestic purposes—were laid in rouleaux or stood in piles upside down on the floors of the rooms. All were quite unused and ready for sale.

The pottery of this, the Third Late Helladic Period or Mycenaean age *par excellence*, is artistically much inferior to that of the two preceding periods. The fine free and naturalistic designs of the earlier times have become conventional and stereotyped. Many natural objects, marine or floral, have lost their shapes and become meaningless patterns. There is a much greater sameness in the motives and we find the same designs repeated again and again with little variation. The painting of the vases is good, leaving out all question of the artistic qualities of the designs

employed, and the shapes are both elegant and well adapted for all kinds of household purposes. The fabric is excellent; the clay is well refined, well baked and of good sound quality. It seems that the potters of this age turned to mass production and developed their art into an industry. One can well imagine that in the less civilized border lands or districts, where the quality of the clay was inferior, there would be a good demand for this excellent pottery, which the skilled craftsmen of Mycenae could turn out *en masse*. We can thus understand why the head man of the hamlet at Zygouries should have combined trade in pots with his other duties. This excellence of Mycenaean pottery may have easily been one reason which made Mycenaean trade flourish in the Aegean basin, just as some centuries later Attic pottery commanded the Etruscan and Italian market.

The most characteristic vase is the stirrup-jar, which, although it makes its appearance much earlier in the First Late Minoan Period in Crete, did not become really popular till the Third Late Helladic civilization flourished on the mainland. This type of vase is often found in Egypt, as at Gurob and at Tell el-Amarna in the rubbish heaps of Ikhnaton's palace. It occurs in Cyprus, Rhodes and Sicily and became a favourite shape in the later Philistine pottery. It was imitated in faïence in Egypt at the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty, and stirrup-jars of a late, probably Philistine, form figure in the paintings of the tomb of Ramses III. Either this type of vase was exported for the sake of the oil, or some other liquid packed in it, or it was in itself a popular object of the export trade in pottery. Weapons and vessels of bronze were probably also an important part of Mycenaean overseas commerce.

As to the religious observances of the Mycenaeans, throughout the Late Helladic Period they seem to have been the same as those of the Cretans. We have at Mycenae and elsewhere the worship of the sacred pillar, the sacred doves and the double-axe. Orgiastic dances were practised, and also the sacrifice of the sacred bull. But the chief cult was that of the Great Mother, the goddess of the double-axe, with whom was associated a young male divinity, probably her son. Her attendant animals include lions and snakes, the latter possibly indicating a Chthonian aspect. To these should be added the cult of the dead, especially of royal persons, possibly because they were regarded as the temporary human manifestations of divinities. This is shown by the enclosing of the Grave Circle at Mycenae, by the stately tholos tombs, and above all by the frequent reopenings of and offerings in the family sepulchres.

The latter, the ordinary family chamber-tombs, are one proof of the unity of the Late Helladic civilization from its beginning in the sixteenth century to its end in the twelfth or later. Many of these chamber-tombs were constructed and first used toward the end of the sixteenth century; other interments were made during the fifteenth, and the families seem to have continued to use them as burial vaults till the twelfth century. Sometimes as many as twenty skeletons are found in one sepulchre, showing with the vases and other offerings how long these tombs were in use. As often as not the later Mycenaeans, when they came to bury their dead, seem to have had no scruples about removing for themselves any of their ancestors' valuables that took their fancy. Occasionally tombs are found which have been almost entirely swept clean of their earlier contents to make them ready for late Mycenaean burials. It was, also, often the custom to brush aside into corners or charnel pits the bones and offerings of the earlier tenants of the tombs. It seems hard to reconcile this curious lack of reverence for the dead with memorial ceremonies which seem to have taken place in the tombs. They may, however, have believed that the spirits stayed by the body so long as the flesh clothed the bones, but when the bones were clean the spirit had departed to the underworld of shades. Thus in the dark tomb chamber which, with its long narrow entrance passage, suggested an approach to the lower world, the survivors could still by use of the proper rites come into communion with the dead and pay them due worship.

As we have said, we know little about the rise of the Mycenaean empire, except that its rise coincided with the fall of Cnossus, and that its most flourishing period covered the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, during which it seems to have been in close touch with Egypt. Later in the twelfth century, when the migrations of peoples began to harass Egypt, the Mycenaean civilization, too, began to decline in power. This, if the traditional dates can be accepted, would have been not long after the fall of Troy. Had the great confederacy of Mycenae overstrained its strength in that war? Whatever the cause, it is certain that, during the twelfth century, the Mycenaean empire declined almost as rapidly as it had arisen. The cause of the decay we know not; all we do know is that Mycenae, Tiryns, Zygouries, Korakou, and all the Mycenaean settlements so far excavated perished by fire. This suggests that they were taken by some invading foe and given to the flames, and it is assumed—since the traditional date again would agree well—that the invaders who overthrew the

Mycenaean culture were the intruding Dorians, called in, perhaps, like Hengist and Horsa, by some dispossessed princeling to help him to regain his throne.

Here archaeology raises difficulties. It is true that the Mycenaean cities perished by fire apparently after being looted. There are some new features: cremation is introduced, but it does not become universal; and the Iron Age begins. There is also a difference in the style of the pottery, for the patterns now become geometric in character. This change, however, is not a sudden one, for, even before the final decline of Mycenaean pottery, the design had been becoming more and more geometric in character, the gradual expression of which can easily be traced. Further, in the developed geometric pottery of the full Iron Age, the use of Mycenaean ornaments is still quite obvious. With the Iron Age certain types of sword supposed to be of Danubian origin, and the *fibula*, or safety-pin, become common; but even these are first found with late, but true Mycenaean pottery. Thus, there is no abrupt cataclysm, for the Mycenaean civilization did not perish, but gradually evolved into another.

It seems probable that this evolution began under the influence of an infiltration or invasion of alien elements. The gradual decline of the Mycenaean culture and the coming of a new people would naturally have disturbed life, and for this reason we find that, after the close of the Mycenaean period proper, and before the new geometric pottery of the Iron Age was fully evolved—probably during the eleventh and tenth centuries—a cloud of confusion descended on Greece. Still the old arts were not forgotten: the memory of the glory of Mycenae and Cnossus remained and, when peace returned, these reminiscences helped to inspire the great art of classic Hellas. Homer has also enshrined many traditions of the great heroic age, and he has preserved for us, as it were in a wonderful poetic summary, the zenith of the marvellous civilization of the Bronze Age; see chap. xviii.

This period of confusion is usually known as the Dorian invasion. Who the Dorians were, whence they came, what were their distinguishing marks in language or culture we do not certainly know, although several attempts have been made to identify certain customs or objects as typically Dorian. We have seen that, during the last two centuries, at least, of the Mycenaean dominion in Greece and the Aegean, there was a cultural *koiné*, and it is at least likely that there was a linguistic *koiné* as well. The use of the same script in Crete, and on the mainland, and apparently on the islands, also seems to point in this direction.

In these circumstances, it is at least remarkable that the regions, which were subsequently the stronghold of the Greek dialect called Dorian, and its allied dialects, should also have been the very districts where the Minoan and Mycenaean civilization especially flourished—Crete, the Peloponnese except Arcadia, Melos, Thera, Rhodes and its neighbours, Boeotia, whose 'Aeolic' dialect is much akin to Doric, and southern Thessaly. The question then arises, Can the Doric dialect represent the real speech of the Dorians, or is it a survival of an older linguistic *koiné*, such as Aeolic, modified by new elements, in much the same way in which English was affected by Norman-French? It is usually assumed that before the Dorian invasion the Peloponnese was divided linguistically between Arcadian and Ionic; this was the view of Pausanias and Herodotus. Arcadian has more in common with Aeolic than with Ionic, while Doric and Aeolic are more nearly related to each other than to Ionic. We find that the inhabitants of classical Mycenae, who might have been supposed to keep themselves free from alien blood, wrote in good broad Doric. When later history tells us of the small numbers of Dorians in Argos, Sparta and Sicyon, can the Dorians really have invaded southern Greece and Crete in such overwhelming numbers as to change entirely the characteristics of the language there spoken? We know that the Dorian invasion assisted the natural evolution of culture, but did not completely alter it. We cannot suppose that the Doric dialect is a wholesale importation, nor can we suppose that it represents the pure speech of the pre-Dorian inhabitants. Bearing in mind the lack of early evidence for the linguistic history of the regions concerned, we may say that the truth probably lies between the two, and that the Doric dialect is a blend of the intruders' speech with the language, possibly Aeolic, spoken by the pre-Dorian folk. See further, pp. 518 *sqq.*

The course of the development of Mycenaean civilization is clear and continuous up to the twelfth century B.C. Even thereafter, the connection, or rather transition, between the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age is obvious. If there was no violent break in culture, need there have been one in language? In language, as in art, the brilliancy of historical Greece seems to have been the renaissance of the greatness of Cnossus and Mycenae. Further, if the Bronze Age population of Crete and the islands spoke some non-Greek language, they, by their occupation of the southern mainland, would have been responsible for the introduction of the non-Greek element recognized in certain place-names and words, such as Corinth, Hymettus

or *asaminthos*. Possibly the Neolithic inhabitants of the mainland spoke some form of Greek, as also the newcomers of Middle Helladic times. If so, the supremacy of Mycenae and the fall of Cnossus at the beginning of the Third Late Helladic Period would reflect the success of the Greek over a non-Greek race. This struggle between the Greek and non-Greek peoples has lasted even to the present day.

VII. THESSALY, MACEDONIA AND TROY

At the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C. Thessaly had already passed into the Bronze Age, though we cannot yet decide in terms of the Helladic or Minoan systems when this occurred. The Third Period in Thessaly had been one of transition apparently between the Neolithic and the Bronze Ages; and, if the pottery characteristic of this transitional period is any guide, the inhabitants of Thessaly at that time would have been in very close touch with the tribes farther north, reaching almost to the Danube valley. Signs of this intermediate Third Period have been found even in Boeotia and Corinthia, thus showing that the third and second stages of culture in Thessaly overlapped considerably. With the advent of the Fourth Period, the full Bronze Age, all connection between the south and Thessaly seems to have been cut off and the chain of Othrys became the boundary between the two areas. All south of Othrys fell first under the Early and Middle Helladic culture, and was ultimately brought into the uniform sphere of the Mycenaean or Late Helladic civilization. Thessaly proper seems to have held aloof from the south for some time, and even communications with the north seem to have been interrupted. At all events, the pottery that is typical of the Thessalian Fourth Period has not yet been found farther north than Macedonia; although it is quite likely that, as exploration extends, it will be found that the Thessalian culture of this period was closely akin to the contemporaneous civilization of the Southern Balkans.

In Thessaly itself the establishment of the Bronze Age seems, as is often the case when some great material or technical improvement takes place, to have been accompanied by a noticeable decline in art (cf. p. 444). The pottery of this period—that is to say, the native Thessalian pottery—is coarse, rude and devoid of decoration. The clay is badly refined and the shapes of the vases are clumsy and ill-designed. The fine painted wares of the First Neolithic Period are much superior and would, if no other criterion were available, be described as the products of an

advanced civilization; while the Bronze Age pottery would be considered to belong to a primitive and barbarous age. Little is known of the Thessalian Bronze Age beyond the main fact that, apart from the discovery and the adoption of bronze, it seems to have been rather a period of stagnation. The use of stone implements still continued: for instance, hammers and heavy axes were still made of stone, though usually bored for the mere insertion of the haft; but small axes and chisels and similar cutting implements were now made of bronze. The terra-cotta figurines of the period are coarse and rough. The houses seem to have been oblong with one rounded end. In the later deposits of this period cist tombs similar to those found in Middle Helladic settlements have been found, and among the débris of contemporary villages one class of Middle Helladic pottery is common.

In strata which immediately succeed these are found remains of Mycenaean pottery of the Third Late Helladic Period. This puts before us an apparent difficulty. One would have expected Middle Helladic pottery to have been found in the earlier strata of the Bronze Age and to have been followed by pottery of the First and Second Late Helladic Periods. We have seen previously that the Thessalian Bronze Age began apparently even before the end of the Early Helladic Period and, if thereafter communications between the regions north and south of Othrys were cut, one would not necessarily expect to find Middle Helladic pottery in Thessaly. Only later would that pottery have reached Thessaly, and it is usually found on sites round the Gulf of Pagasae, as though the southern influence had reached Thessaly by sea. That tombs typical of the Middle Helladic age should also be found in Thessaly, even though in comparatively late strata, suggests that some of the southern folk pushed their way north and even settled here and there in Thessaly. That ordinary late Mycenaean pottery should follow Middle Helladic pottery on Thessalian sites so quickly stratigraphically is perhaps an accident due to the telescoping of the upper strata. It stands to reason that in the case of mound sites the upper strata should be subject to various influences, such as weather, cultivation or later occupation, which would disturb, denude and compress the upper or later strata. Further, the number of sites so far excavated in Thessaly is small. If a large site, such as that of Iolcus, could be tested, results would probably be obtained which would supplement the existing evidence, and set the relations between Thessaly and the south in their true perspective.

Some pottery of the Second Late Helladic Period has been found in Thessaly, but in tombs and not in a stratified site. On

the other hand, the finding at Kapakli, near Iolcus, of a built tholos tomb with pottery and other objects of the Second Late Helladic Period show that by the fifteenth century at least Mycenaean culture had taken hold of Thessaly, especially the sea-board of the Gulf of Pagasae. It is noticeable that even in the Third Late Helladic Period, when Mycenaean pottery is found thinly all over Thessaly, it seems to radiate from the shores of the Gulf of Pagasae, as though, when Thessaly finally fell under the influence of the southern culture, the penetration came from the sea and not overland through the Othrys range. Another tholos tomb, but of the Third Late Helladic Period, has been excavated at Dimeni, also near the head of the Gulf of Pagasae. Hence it is probable that by the fourteenth century, even while coarse undecorated pottery was being made locally, Mycenaean influence was supreme on the Thessalian seaboard and very powerful in the *hinterland*.

Although the Mycenaean culture had thus drawn Thessaly within its sphere, the rude local culture still subsisted, and before it could be entirely replaced by the Mycenaean the Bronze Age came to an end. And with the beginning of the Iron Age came disturbances which introduced fresh influences. In the transitional period, which fell between the end of the Bronze Age and the full Iron Age, a local variety of pottery ornamented with geometric patterns of a simple character was common in Thessaly. It derives its characteristics, partly from the late and degenerate Mycenaean pottery, and partly from new elements introduced from the north or north-west. That this culture was connected with the Mycenaean is shown by the fact that at Marmariæ vases of this class have been found in small rough tholos tombs not unlike the small tholos tombs of the corresponding period in Crete. Thessaly, which had apparently long served as a buffer state between the Mycenaean empire and the barbarians of the north, came late into the Mycenaean orbit, and was never in it long enough for the Mycenaean culture to leave any great impression; thus it was less fitted to resist the invasions or disturbances that marked the beginning of the Iron Age. It had never become an organized bulwark of the Mycenaean power; hence, the way for northern inroads into Greece was more open than it had been before Mycenaean influence permeated Thessaly. The very spread of Mycenaean power broke down the natural defences, and, when the central power weakened, thus contributed to its own downfall.

Of Macedonia and Thrace during this period we know little that is definite. There was some cultural connection between Macedonia and Thessaly, and again between Macedonia and

Thrace. Thrace, too, is linked to Troy and north-eastern Asia Minor. There seems also to have been contact at least between Macedonia and Thrace and the Danube valley to the north. Of the history of these districts in relation to one another we know nothing as yet, except that the farther north we advance the later we find that civilization developed. During the latter part of the Late Helladic Period, probably from the fourteenth century onwards, Mycenaean culture reached the Macedonian coast; but, as far as we know at present, made no permanent settlement. Since, however, Mycenae seems to have controlled the seas, Mycenaean influence would have been the strongest force along the littoral.

As previously stated, after the fall of the second city at Troy, which we cannot yet date in terms of the Minoan system, the site was occupied by small and insignificant settlements. The third, fourth and fifth 'cities' of Troy were weak and poor hamlets. It is with the sixth city that Troy rises to importance again, and, since Mycenaean pottery has been found in the ruins of the sixth city, we can assign an approximate date to it. The earliest Mycenaean potsherds found at Troy are of the Second Late Helladic Period; and we may therefore say that Troy again rose to power about the end of the sixteenth century B.C. It is thus possible that the third, fourth and fifth cities covered the period of the Middle Helladic and First Late Helladic ages. The sixth city of Troy, although strongly fortified, is still very small in area, and should really be described as a castle rather than a city. In fact, the whole area of the sixth city was in later times occupied by the shrine of Athena. Owing to the levelling undertaken when the classical Ilion was built, none of the buildings, except for unimportant walls within the fortifications, have survived. The mighty walls themselves, however, bear silent witness to the strength and wealth of Troy. The walls still stand to a considerable height: they have a scarped base six to seven feet high to carry the vertical superstructure. There are three gates, two built on the same plan as the Lion Gate at Mycenae, with the entrance running obliquely through the walls, and the third with the entrance running straight through, but guarded by a strong tower on the left. These big square towers, of which three can be clearly seen, are a prominent feature of the Trojan fortifications and do not occur at Mycenae, Tiryns or Goulas.

Although Mycenaean pottery has been found in Troy, yet, in the main, the culture of the city was native. The bulk of the pottery, for instance, is of local manufacture, although much of it closely resembles one variety of Middle Helladic ware. This

circumstance has induced some to suggest that the Middle Helladic culture was partly derived from Troy, but this is impossible, since it is clear from independent evidence that the Middle Helladic period antedates by some centuries the sixth city of Troy. This peculiar local pottery is also typical of the seventh city at Troy, which, much smaller and less important, succeeded the downfall of the strong fortifications of the sixth city. Both in the sixth and seventh cities were found a number of objects, principally carved axe-heads of stone and others of bronze, which show a striking likeness to finds from Serbia and the Danubian region, and may indicate the Thracio-Phrygian culture pushing across from Europe to Asia Minor. Some fragments of Cypriote pottery found at Troy indicate trading connections with that island; this is not surprising, seeing how strong Mycenaean influence was there. Still, although Mycenaean objects are fairly plentiful at Troy, the fact remains that the culture of Troy had reached a high level and was independent of the Mycenaean, unlike the Thessalian. The fortified castle of Troy does not bear any strong resemblance to any Mycenaean citadel: the construction and plan are very different. Troy is to be regarded not as an outpost of the Mycenaean civilization, but as one of the principal seats of alien culture that came into close touch with it by trade or otherwise. It is, indeed, quite likely that a rivalry may have developed between them which led to the great expedition against Troy, which is not an Aegean site, but stands midway between Asia Minor and the Danubian area. We must wait for further exploration in the adjoining regions before we can define its position more closely.

The later part of the Bronze Age in the Aegean basin saw the brilliance and fall of Cnossus, the dominion and the overthrow of Mycenae, and finally the strength and destruction of Troy. The sixteenth century began with great promise of progress and prosperity, and the end of the Bronze Age in the twelfth century saw the coming of the Iron Age, the fall of the ruling powers and the decline of civilization. The opening of the new age must, indeed, have seemed, as the ancients believed, a change for the worse. Everything appears to have lost its stability, and confusion and invasion to have precluded any return to peace; yet, out of the troubled darkness, which shrouded the transition from the age of Bronze to that of Iron, came at last the wonderful renaissance which produced the art and literature of classical Hellas. All that had gone before was preparing the way for the brighter days to come.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ACHAEANS AND THE TROJAN WAR

I. ACHAEAN GREECE

THE discoveries in Greek soil described in the last chapter show that in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. there were rich and powerful states in southern and central Greece, possessing an advanced civilization. There can be no reasonable doubt that the rulers of these states were of Greek stock, or, at all events, spoke Greek, but as to their history we have no traditions on which we can rely till we approach the middle of the thirteenth century. We cannot, for instance, connect the building of the palace on the Acropolis of Mycenae or of the somewhat later palace of Tiryns with any particular name or dynasty. Two things, however, we may venture to say. The general evidence of tradition points to Pelasgians as a very prominent and powerful people during this period in many parts of Greece. And secondly, it seems probable that by this time the pre-Greek inhabitants generally, except in a few outlying places, had been subjugated or expelled by Greeks; and among these earlier peoples we may perhaps, with some confidence, name the Leleges, many of whom migrated eastward, to the Aegean islands, and to Asia Minor where they afterwards appear in the full light of history. But by the middle of the thirteenth century another people, the Achaeans, have come to the front, and from this time tradition begins to furnish some information which appears to be more or less trustworthy, dealing with names which represent real persons and commemorating actual occurrences.

By 1200 B.C. we find Achaeans the ruling people in Crete, and at the same time so many of the chief principalities in Greece have Achaean rulers that 'Achaean' is in a fair way to become a general name for Greek-speaking peoples. Civilization in Greece had not stood still during two centuries; there had been changes in manners and customs—in dress, for instance, and armour. The Greeks of the Achaean period do not present the same appearance as they had presented before 1400 B.C. These differences have suggested the view that the Achaeans were not a Greek people, but northern invaders, who came down from the

Danube region to the Aegean, perhaps towards the end of the fifteenth century. Their invasion has been conceived, not as the migration of a people, but as a series of movements of bands of warriors, who went forth in successive relays to carve out kingdoms for themselves in the rich lands of the Aegean. One of their first exploits is supposed by some to have been the destruction of the palace of Cnossus. Gradually they established themselves in many parts of Greece, especially in the valley of the Spercheus in the north, and in the Peloponnesus, expelling the Greek princes and inheriting their palaces and wealth. Marrying Greek wives, they had become, in the course of a few generations, completely Greek, had forgotten their own language, and the only sign of their foreign origin was that some of them (it is alleged) were blonds, like Menelaus and Rhadamanthys, whom Homer is said to have described as such¹. But they introduced new weapons, and methods of warfare, and customs, which they had brought with them from the north, and this would explain the differences which we observe between the civilization described in Homer's poems and that which Mycenae reveals some centuries earlier.


This theory, ably as it has been defended, cannot be accepted as probable. It is difficult to believe that Greek tradition should have preserved no memory of barbarian invasions from the north, no inkling that the Achaeans were of foreign origin. The Achaeans were always regarded as one of the native peoples of Greece—like the Pelasgians, Hellenes, Boeotians, Dryopians and many others—originally living in the north, in the valley of the Spercheus and its neighbourhood. And there seems to be nothing in the facts that need be inconsistent with this view. It may turn out that the principal changes which time brought about in manners and customs were due to influences from the east, and that if there was any influence from the north, there are other possible explanations; the Phrygians or Dardanians, for instance, could have been the channel. Thessaly had some contact with the civilization of Macedonia and the north (see above, pp. 468, 470), but there is nothing in Thessaly and Phthia to suggest the presence of northern invaders. The truth seems to be that from 1500 to 1200 B.C. the north exercised no great influence on the civilization of the Aegean.

Moreover, the Greek tradition of the history of the thirteenth century presents us with a picture of movements, constant and

¹ But *ξανθός* should rather be translated *brown*. See above, chap. II, p. 22

(Only names occurring in Homer are given, and usually in the Homeric form.)

Alypius, F. 2
 Aledanus, R., C. 3
 Aegaeus, C. 3
 Aegialius, CD. 3
 Aegina, D. 4
 Aenu, F. 2
 Aesopus, R., F. 2, 3
 Aethalians, C. 3
 Alpheus, R., C. 4
 Apasorus, F. 2
 Arcadia, CD. 4
 Argos, D. 4
 Arisbe, F. 2
 Ascania, Lake, G. 2
 Athens, D. 4
 Atrios, M., E. 2
 Aulis, D. 3
 Armus, R., D. 2
 Boobus, Lake, D. 3
 Calyndae, F. 4
 Celydon, C. 3
 Caninus, F. 4
 Caninus, FG. 4
 Carystus, F. 3
 Casus, F. 3
 Cephallemus, B. 3, 4, C. 4
 Chaicos, D. 3
 Chios, EF. 3
 Crocones, E. 2
 Cossius, E. 2
 Cortiada, D. 4
 Cos, F. 4
 Crapatus, F. 3
 Crete, DEF. 5
 Cyclonius, DE. 5
 Cythera, D. 4
 Dardanius, F. 3
 Delos, E. 4
 Dia, E. 4
 Dolocia, C. 3
 Dulicium, C. 3
 Echinos, C. 3
 Emathus, CD. 2
 Epaeus, C. 3, 4
 Etruria, D. 3
 Embosa, DE. 3
 Gortyna, F. 5
 Gygean Lake, F. 3
 Harmus, R., FG. 3
 Hastiae, D. 3
 Hyde, M., F. 3
 Hypothaeae, E. 3
 Ialysus, G. 4
 Ida, M., F. 3
 Imbros, E. 2
 Iolcus, D. 3
 Ismarus, E. 2
 Ithaca, C. 3
 Lacedaemon, B. 4
 Larina, F. 3
 Lemnos, E. 3
 Lesbos, EF. 3
 Lindus, G. 4
 Locri, D. 3
 Lycia, GH. 4
 Lycus, E. 5
 Maeonians, C. 3
 Males, C., D. 4
 Milesia (in Crete), E. 5
 Milesia (in Asia Minor), F. 4
 Myale, M., F. 4
 Myeneae, D. 4
 Mysians, FG. 3
 Nisa, D. 4
 Nisyrtus, F. 4
 Oelytus, D. 4
 Oloncus, D. 3
 Olusson, D. 3
 Olympos, M., D. 2
 Ossa, M., D. 3
 Paconians, D. 2
 Paeisig Argos, CD. 3
 Pelion, M., D. 3
 Permes, R., D. 3
 Perote, F. 4
 Phaeacia (?), D. 3
 Phaeustus, F. 5
 Phoca, C. 4
 Phereae, D. 3
 Phocians, D. 3
 Phrygius, G. 2
 Pithon (?), FG. 4
 Pieria, C. 2
 Pityra, F. 2
 Pylius, C. 4
 Pytho, D. 3
 Rhodes, F. 4, 5, G. 4
 Rhyum, E. 5
 Salamis, D. 4
 Samos, C. 3
 Samos, E. 2
 Sangarum, R., H. 2
 Syrtus, C. 3
 Scyrus, E. 2
 Sicym, D. 4
 Sipylius, F. 3
 Solyma, M., H. 4
 Sparta, D. 4
 Spheerum, R., CD. 3
 Syra, C. 3
 Syrm, F. 4
 Tarna, F. 3
 Tegea, D. 4
 Teudus, F. 3
 Thebes, F. 3
 Thoponians, C. 3
 Thrace, F. 3
 Thronum, D. 3
 Tricra, C. 3
 Troy, F. 3
 Xanthus, R., G. 4
 Zacynthus, C. 4
 Zela, F. 3



active, between south and north Greece; members of ruling families going abroad, whether of their own will or driven out, sometimes guilty of homicide and fleeing from the vengeance of the victim's kinsmen, and then winning, by marriage or otherwise, a throne or principality in some other country. If we accept the traditional view that the Achaeans were Greeks, originally living in the north, in the regions of the rivers Spercheus and Peneus and the Malian Gulf, their rise to power and eminence in southern Greece, Crete and elsewhere, may have been simply the result of movements of this kind. The Greeks of the north were poorer and lived in much ruder conditions than the Greeks of the south. Exploration of the lands north of Mount Oeta and the Malian Gulf has revealed no sign that there was there any city or palace which could even distantly be compared to Mycenae or Tiryns or Orchomenus. We can easily understand that adventurers from this region, in search of a kingdom or a fortune, should have been ubiquitous. We find Achaeans attacking Egypt, about 1223 B.C. In an inscription which records how king Merneptah repulsed a Libyan invasion, supported by a number of seafaring peoples, their name (*Ekwesh* or *Akaiwasha*) appears¹.

They ventured eastward as well as southward; if the story of the sailing of Jason in the 'Argo,' from the port of Iolcus in Thessaly, to win the Golden Fleece is based on an Achaean adventure to the Hellespont and Propontis, which actually resulted in a Greek settlement in the island of Lemnos.

An Achaean dynasty was established in Crete and ruled over the whole island. During the second half of the thirteenth century the central fact of Greek history was the sea-power of Crete under Minos and his son Deucalion. According to tradition the principal feat of Minos was to reduce to tribute the Carian inhabitants of the Aegean islands who lived on piracy and rendered legitimate seafaring difficult and perilous. In his days Cretan enterprise may have extended to Sicily, where legend said that he died (Sophocles wrote a tragedy on the subject), and a city was called by his name, Minoa². The name Minoa in Corcyra suggests that his ships sailed in Ionian and Adriatic waters; Minoa in the Megarid, that he gained a footing on the Isthmus; and there was another Minoa on the east coast of Laconia (at Monembasia). If Theseus

¹ See above, pp. 167, 276. It is possible that these Achaeans were from Crete.

² It has been pointed out that at Eryx the dove-goddess has the attributes of the Cretan nature-goddess, the pillar shrine and the swastika. Cp. Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, I, 95 sq.

of Athens and Minos of Crete are accepted as historical persons, the story of the tribute of youths and maidens which Minos exacted from Attica to feed the Minotaur may preserve an historical fact, an attempt of the Achaeans of Crete to subjugate the Pelasgian rulers of Athens¹.

It is possible that what Achaeans were doing at this time was not a new thing. Much the same may have been done in an earlier age by Pelasgians. For it seems probable that the original home of the Pelasgians was also in northern Greece. Their name remained associated with Dodona in Epirus; the valley of the river Spercheus was still called, under the Achaean dominion, 'Pelasgian Argos'; and the Pelasgian name abode, throughout later history, in Pelasgiotis, one of the districts of Thessaly. It travelled southward like the Achaean. Pelasgians settled in Crete and they occupied Attica. From Attica they were never driven either by Achaean or by other strangers. They also settled in the Peloponnesus, in Arcadia and in Argos. They made their way to Asia, as we shall presently see. Aeschylus believed² that there was at one time a Pelasgian empire, with its centre at Argos, extending over all Greek lands and reaching even to the Strymon. The name, which is unlike the names of other Greek peoples, has always been a puzzle. One explanation is that it means plain-dwellers, being connected with *pelagos* (sea-plain, like the Latin *aequor*), a derivation which linguistically seems irreproachable²; another equates it with that of the Pelagones, an ancient people who are supposed to have dwelt between the rivers Axius and Strymon, and according to this view they were not Greeks but Illyrians.

In the early thirteenth century the leading people in the Peloponnesus seem to have been the Danai, who are particularly associated with Argos. Perseus who ruled over Mycenae and Tiryns, before the middle of the century, belonged to this people, as well as Proetus who appears to have been king of Argos. The fortunes of this dynasty, the manner in which a new dynasty was engrafted on to it, and the resulting division of the Argive power,

¹ The view of some Greek chronologists (*Parian Chronicle*) that there were two rulers of Crete named Minos, separated by a century and a half, has been advocated by Sir William Ridgeway. But all the Minos passages in Homer are explicable as referring to the same person, the father of Deucalion, and there is no other good evidence suggesting two Minoses or a Minos prior to the thirteenth century B.C.

² For another view of the Pelasgians and the meaning of the name see above, p. 8. For the view that they were pre-Greek, cp. below, p. 544.

as recorded in tradition, exhibit the character of the political changes which formed the chronicle of Greek history in this age.

In the time of Perseus a stranger arrived in the west of the Peloponnesus, married the daughter of the king of Pisa, and succeeded him. This was Pelops. Tradition said that he came from Asia, and the historian Thucydides ascribed his success and the eminent position he won in the peninsula, to which his name was afterwards given, to the wealth he brought from the east. We know nothing about him, but his name is Greek, and, as his descendants were Achaeans, he must have been an Achaean. His daughter married Sthenelus, son of Perseus and king of Argos. Their son was Eurystheus. The reign of Eurystheus was troubled by the pretensions of his cousin Heracles to a share in the Argive kingdom. After his death, Mycenae passed peaceably into the hands of his uncle Atreus, son of Pelops; and this was the beginning of the great political power of the Achaeans in the Peloponnesus. But Atreus did not acquire Argos or Tiryns; and we presently find Argos under the rule of another stranger, Adrastus, who was also an Achaean¹.

The reign of Adrastus was marked by wars between Argos and Thebes, the leading power in central Greece. The first expedition of Adrastus—famous in story as that of the Seven against Thebes—was a failure, but a second ended in the utter defeat of the Thebans. Their great citadel was destroyed, and for a generation there was no Thebes, but only 'Lower Thebes,' Hypothebae, the town beneath the ruined fortress. Atreus took no part in these wars, but the victory may be said to have been an Achaean achievement. Adrastus had the help in his campaigns of Tydeus and his son Diomedes. Tydeus belonged to an Achaean family which had established itself in Aetolia. He fled, on account of homicide, to Argos, where he married the daughter of Adrastus, and was killed in the first Theban expedition. His son Diomedes took part in the second, and on the death of his uncle Adrastus was the principal, though not sole, heir of the Argive kingdom. Long before this a strong Achaean power had been established in the western Peloponnesus by Neleus, south of the Alpheus.

Meanwhile the power of the Achaean Pelopids increased. Atreus had two sons, Agamemnon and Menelaus. They married Clytaemnestra and Helen, the daughters of Tyndareus, king of Lacedaemon, and after his death they inherited his possessions. The lord of Mycenae (whether Atreus or one of his Perseid pre-

¹ He was descended from Amythaon, brother of Neleus (*Odyssey*, 11, 259). It is not certain that he was the same person as Adrastus, king of Sicyon.


decessors) had also won the strong height of Corinth, the key to the passage between northern and southern Greece; the native dynasty of Sisyphus had been, if not expelled, reduced to vassal-dom. The whole north coast of the Peloponnesus along the Corinthian Gulf was another acquisition, and in this region Agamemnon rounded off his territorial power by the conquest of Sicyon. The fertile plain, about twelve miles long, which has Sicyon at one end and Corinth at the other, was an acquisition of importance for the treasury of Mycenae.

This dry chronicle of the changes in southern Greece from the reign of Perseus to the reign of Agamemnon would be a most exciting story of adventures and crimes and intrigues, if it were possible for a historian to divide fact from fiction in the rich material from which our knowledge of the time is derived. This cannot be done. In the thirteenth and twelfth centuries the mythopoeic faculty of the Greeks transformed the Greece of their fathers into a world of wonder and enchantment in which the princes are closely associated with gods and become the heroes of imaginary adventures taken from old popular tales of dateless antiquity. Many of the princes mentioned in the preceding pages are still familiar names in the nurseries of Europe; Perseus, who slew the Gorgon Medusa and delivered Andromeda from the sea-monster; Heracles, hero of the impossible labours which were set him by Eurystheus; Minos and Theseus; Jason the sailor of the 'Argo.' It has been common in modern times to regard these and the other heroes of this age, whose names come into the fairy tales, as purely mythical creations. The later Greeks, in criticizing the records of their past, had no doubt that they were historical persons who actually ruled in Argos and other kingdoms; and, after a period of extreme scepticism, many modern critics have begun to revert to the Greek view as that which explains the evidence most satisfactorily and simply. It has been adopted in this chapter without hesitation. The heroes of the tales, like the geographical scenes in which they moved, are real, and there was always something in the events of their lives that provided a motive for the legends which were woven round them. In some cases the motive may be surmised with probability, in others it may be indiscoverable. Myth usually permits itself large liberty in respect of time and dates, but it is remarkable how chronologically consistent the account of these early kings is, as it was preserved in the ninth century B.C., and passed into the verses of Homer. It is only incidentally that Homer refers to the heroes of the two generations preceding the Trojan War, but his refer-

INDEX TO NAMES

(Only names occurring in *Homer* are given, and usually in the *Homeric form*)

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Aegae, C 1 | Ithaca, A 1 |
| Aegialus, B 1 | |
| Aegina, D 1 | Lacedaemon C 2, 3 |
| Aegum, C 1 | Las, C 3 |
| Amyclae, C 2 | |
| Arachthys, C 2 | Manthua C 2 |
| Aradia, C 2 | Mases, D 2 |
| Arene, B 1 | Mesa, C 3 |
| Argos, C 2 | Mycaenae, C 2 |
| Asine, C 2 | Myrsinus, B 2 |
| | |
| Brysaee, C 2 | (A)tylus, C 3 |
| Buprasium, B 1 | Olenus, B 1 |
| | Orchomenus, C 2 |
| | |
| Cardamyle, C 3 | Ormai, C 2 |
| Cleonae, C 2 | |
| Corinth, C 2 | Pedaeus, B 3 |
| Cranae I., C 3 | Tellene, C 1 |
| Cyllene, Mt. C 1 | Pharri, C 3 |
| Cyparissiae, B 2 | Phlae, B 2 |
| | Pheneus, C 2 |
| | Phorae, C 2 |
| Dorion, B 1 | Pylus, B 2 |
| | |
| Eaonae, C 1 | |
| Elis, B 2 | Samos, A 1 |
| Epeans, B 1, 2 | Sicyon, C 2 |
| Epidauros, B 2 | Sparta, C 2 |
| Erymanthus, Mt. B 2 | Symphalyus, C 2 |
| | |
| Conocosa, C 2 | Taygetus, Mt. G 2, 3 |
| | Tegae, C 2 |
| Helice, C 1 | Thyrum, B 2 |
| Helos, C 3 | Tiryns, C 2 |
| Hermione, D 2 | Troezen, D 2 |
| Hyperesia, C 1 | |
| Hyrmyrae, B 1 | Zacynthus, A 2 |



ences show that he had in his mind a clear picture of their chronological order. Nor is there any difficulty in understanding how the memory of that order was preserved, even in the absence of chronicles or lists, when we realize that, in the heroic age, the deeds of princes were sung by minstrels in the days of their sons and grandsons. The minstrels created the mythology. They cast into legendary moulds striking deeds and events of their own time, and the chieftains who played eminent parts were transmuted into heroes. It was chiefly through their songs and stories that the names of these kings passed down to posterity; there was no sober historical record to control the extravagance of heroic poetry; and the later Greeks looked upon their ancestors as very different from later men, nearer to the stature of the gods to whom they ascribed the original parentage of their leading families. When we call this period—the thirteenth and twelfth centuries—the ‘heroic age,’ the true significance of this convenient term is that heroic poetry was a characteristic feature of the life of the time, and became the glass through which it was seen and appreciated by posterity.

At the beginning of the twelfth century, the sons of Atreus possessed the strongest power and the widest domains in all Greece. For this time we have in Homer’s Catalogue the following picture of the political geography of Greece and it is entirely different from anything we find at any later epoch.

In the Peloponnesus there were four principal states, all Achaean. (1, 2) The kingdoms of the Atridae, who to the inheritance of their fathers had added, by their marriages, the inheritance of Tyndareus. Agamemnon took Mycenae and Corinth with its isthmus, Sicyon and Cleonae, and the long aegialus or riviera from Corinth to Aegium and beyond—the later Achaea. Menelaus succeeded to Lacedaemon and had his palace at Sparta, which possibly was then situated not on the site of the later city, but at Therapne on the other side of the river Eurotas. The two brothers held Messenia jointly. Between them they ruled half the area of the Peloponnesus, and their concordant policy rendered them virtually a single power. (3) Argos. This state, one for military purposes at least, was ruled by Diomedes and two other princes, Sthenelus, who belonged to the old Argive family, and Euryalus, nephew of Adrastus. It included the whole of what in later times was known as Argolis (except Mycenae), and also the island of Aegina. (4) In the west, Nestor, son of Neleus, ruled over the kingdom of Pylos, extending from the river Alpheus in the north into Messenia. The royal seat was at Pylos (Kakovatos), which

used to be confused with a different place on the same coast, the Messenian Pylus opposite the island of Sphacteria. Besides these four important kingdoms there were (5) the inland Arcadians, who in their land of hills were always less affected by political changes than any of their neighbours and whose boundaries were always much the same¹; and (6) the Epeans of Elis on the north-western seaboard whose territory marched with Agamemnon's kingdom near the rock of Olenus and extended on the south towards the river Peneus. In this survey the whole region between the Alpheus and the Peneus, in which was the kingdom of Pisa, is omitted. It was here that Pelops is said to have reigned, but we do not hear what became of it when the Pelopids had risen to greatness in the east and south. Some part of the coastland belonged to (7) the Cephallenian islanders of Zacynthus, Samos (Cephallenia) and Ithaca, who together formed a loose state under the lordship of an Achaean king, Odysseus of Ithaca. Further north, there was another island kingdom, an Epean colony, in (8) Dulichium (the later Leucas), which included the Echinad islets off the Acarnanian coast and probably some part of the mainland, from which it was divided by so narrow a channel that its insularity was ambiguous.


In central Greece (9) the Aetolians occupied the territory which was always to be theirs, and Calydon, Pleuron, and Chalcis were already among their chief towns; there is some evidence that Thermum was already a place of note. They had neighbours with whom they were sometimes at war, the Curetes, whom they are said to have driven out of Aetolia and who perhaps lived in Acarnania. The limits of (10) the Phocians were much the same as in later history. They had Pytho, the seat of Apollo's oracle, and Crisa with its plain, on the Corinthian Gulf, and they had probably, as in later times, another sea outlet at Daphnus on the straits opposite Euboea, with a coast-strip which divided the territory of (11) the Locrians into two sections, a southern round Opus and Cynus, and a northern round Thronium. The Locrians were ruled by Ajax, the son of Oileus. It was probably a native dynasty. The dominating power in central Greece was that of (12) the Boeotians. They had twenty-nine towns. Hypothebae, Thisbe, and Thespieae, Coronea and Haliartus, Plataea and Erythrae, and others well known in later history were among

¹ The statement in Homer that Agamemnon supplied the Arcadians with ships does not prove that they were politically dependent on him. As they had no ships of their own, they could not have joined in the expedition unless transports had been supplied by its leader.

INDEX TO NAMES

(Only names occurring in *Homer* are given, and usually in the *Homeric* form.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| Abantos, D ₃ | Iolcus, C ₂ |
| Achaeus, H., B ₃ | Ithaca, A ₃ |
| Aegium, C ₃ | Iton, C ₂ |
| Aethices, B ₂ | |
| Aetolians, B ₃ | Lilaea, C ₃ |
| Alope, C ₃ | Locri, CD ₃ |
| Anemorea, C ₃ | |
| Anthedon, D ₃ | Magneto, C ₂ |
| Antron, C ₃ | Meliboia, C ₂ |
| Arne (?), B ₂ | Methone, D ₂ |
| Aspledon, C ₃ | Myniae, D ₃ |
| Asterium (?), C ₂ | Myralessus, D ₃ |
| Athens, D ₄ | |
| Atlis, D ₃ | Nisa, D ₄ |
| | |
| Boebe, C ₂ | Ocala, D ₃ |
| Boebis, Lake, C ₂ | Olenus, B ₃ |
| Boeotians, CD ₃ | Olizon, D ₂ |
| Buprasium, B ₃ | Oliosson, C ₂ |
| | Olympus, Mt., C ₁ |
| | Onchestus, D ₃ |
| Calydon, B ₃ | Opy, D ₃ |
| Cephus, R., C ₃ | Orchomenus, C ₃ |
| Ceranthus, D ₃ | Ormenium (?), C ₂ |
| Chalcis, B ₃ | Ossa, Mt., C ₂ |
| Chalcis (in Euboea), D ₃ | |
| Copae, D ₃ | Panopeus, C ₃ |
| Corinth, C ₄ | Pelaeus Argos, C ₃ |
| Coronae, C ₃ | Pelion, Mt., D ₂ |
| Cris, C ₃ | Peneus, R., C ₂ |
| Curetes (?), B ₃ | Peraea, A ₂ |
| Cynus, D ₃ | Perna, C ₂ |
| | Phacra, C ₂ |
| Daulis, C ₃ | Phocians, C ₃ |
| Dium, C ₃ | Phthia, C ₂ , C ₃ |
| Dodona, A ₂ | Phylae, C ₂ |
| Dolopes, B ₂ , C ₃ | Plataea, D ₃ |
| Dulichium, A ₃ | Pleuron, B ₃ |
| | Pleum, C ₂ |
| Echiniae, AB ₃ | Pylene, B ₃ |
| Elis, B ₃ , C ₄ | Pyrasus, C ₂ |
| Epheira, D ₃ | Pylus, C ₃ |
| Erythrae, D ₃ | |
| Euboea, D ₃ | Salamis, D ₄ |
| Entreis, D ₃ | Samos, A ₃ |
| | Scarpheia, C ₃ |
| | Scolus, D ₃ |
| | Speicheus, R., C ₃ |
| Glaphyrae, C ₂ | |
| Gilias, D ₃ | |
| Gyrton, C ₂ | |
| | |
| Haliartus, D ₃ | Taphians (?), A ₃ |
| Harma, D ₃ | Thaumacia, C ₂ |
| Hellas, C ₃ | Thespea, D ₃ |
| Histiatae, D ₃ | Thesprotians, A ₂ |
| Hyampolis, C ₃ | Thioe, C ₃ |
| Hyia, D ₃ | Thronium, C ₃ |
| Hypothebae, D ₃ | Trechis, C ₃ |
| | Tricca, B ₂ |



them. They formed some sort of political community though they were not under a single supreme king, and their power reached southward, beyond the limits of later Boeotia, to the isthmus. For they had a settlement on the Saronic Gulf, at Nisa, afterwards Nisaea, the port of Megara which did not yet exist. On the other hand, to the north of lake Copais the little state of (13) the Minyae of Orchomenus, afterwards to be part of Boeotia, was still separate. This people had access to the sea at Larymna, for the coastline between Locris and Boeotian Anthedon belonged to them. (14) Attica was under Menestheus, the lord of Athens, all except Eleusis on its plain between Mounts Cithaeron and Aegaleos, which was an independent state, but had no sea power and did not count politically. (15) Salamis, ruled by the Achaeon Ajax, son of Telamon and nephew of Peleus, whose family had formerly possessed Aegina, and (16) the Abantes of Euboea, in which all the towns that were to play any part in later history are already prominent, were the remaining powers in central Greece.

North of Mount Oeta, where civilization had lagged behind Boeotia, Attica and the south, nine separate states are enumerated. Of these the most important was (17) the Pelasgian Argos, or Phthia, the kingdom of Peleus. It extended along the north of the Malian Gulf and up the valley of the river Spercheus to the border of the Dolopians, who lived under Mount Tymphrestus, and southward into the region of Oeta. Here dwelt the Achaeans and the Myrmidons, and here, somewhere under Oeta, was the original Hellas, whose inhabitants, the Hellenes, were ruled by a subordinate prince. The kingdom of Peleus might be designated as Phthia, but Phthia was probably a wider geographical term, comprising not only the Sperchean valley, but south-eastern Thessaly. Of the eight (18-25) petty principalities into which the later Thessaly was divided, two may be singled out for notice; that of Eumelus, son of Admetus, who ruled over Iolcus, Phærae and Boebe; and a north-western dominion among the upper streams of the Peneus, which bestrode the mountain range of Pindus and included the Peraebi, and the oracle of Dodona, as well as the Eniënes, whose home at this time cannot be located—in later days we find them farther south near Mount Oeta. In all this country few of the chief places were of note in later times, and many of the places recorded are of very uncertain position.

To complete this survey of the Greek world, we have to glance at the island states in the Aegean. Here we have first of all (26) Achaeon Crete, known as the land 'of a hundred cities,'

under princes of whom the Achaean Idomeneus, son of Deucalion and grandson of Minos, was chief. The principal cities at this time, besides Cnossus, Phaestus and Gortyn, were Lyctus, Miletus, Lycastus and Rhytium. Greek settlements had also been planted in the islands off the southern coast of Asia Minor. In (27) Rhodes, Tlepolemus, a son of Heracles, had made his fortune and risen to power over its three communities, Lindus, Ialysus and Camirus¹. Another son of Heracles had colonized (28) Cos and formed an island state, which included the Calydnæ, Nisyrus, Carpathus and Casus. Finally, the little island of (29) Syme, north of Rhodes, was Greek, and its prince Nireus was remembered as the comeliest man, except Achilles, who went to the Trojan War. Of Melos, Thera, and the Cyclades, we hear nothing, and it has been supposed by some that they were subject to Agamemnon. But it may be that they formed part of the dominion of Crete.

In this enumeration, based on Homer's list of the peoples who fought against Troy, there are seven which were considerably superior to the rest in numbers and resources: the two kingdoms of the Atridae, Crete, Phthia, Argos, Pylus, and the Boeotians; and of these all but the Boeotians—whose actual strength as a state was disproportionate to their numbers because their union was loose—were governed by Achaean dynasties.

The king of Mycenæ exercised a sort of primacy or leadership in the Greek world. To speak of a Mycenaean 'empire' is perhaps an overstatement. No one paid him tribute, no one owed him military service, outside his own kingdom. Nor is there any proof that he was the head of a formal political confederacy. But the Pelopids had a superior position which was acknowledged by the other princes, and it appears that this was due, not merely to their greater wealth and military power, but also to some eminence—'kinglihood'—the reason of which is obscure. It was symbolized by the sceptre of Pelops (said to have been made by the god Hephaestus) which he gave to Atreus, and which was handed down to Agamemnon. It is possible that the word *kreiōn* was used to indicate the superior position of the Pelopid sovrän over the ordinary king (*basileus*). It may be that he possessed some sort of overlordship over the princes in the Peloponnesus, for we are told that Agamemnon ruled over 'all Argos and many islands.' Argos, where it does not refer to the town, means in Homer sometimes the Peloponnesus, sometimes the Argive plain; and

¹ For the possibility that there were Dorians in this settlement see below, p. 528 sq.

the islands may possibly include the Cephallenian group as well as those off the coasts of Argolis, Laconia and Messenia. But we do not know what was involved in this vague rule. It may be only an exaggerated description of the authority which his power gave him at the courts of Pylus and Argos as well as Sparta; there is no reason to suppose that there were any formal agreements (*rhētrai*), written or unwritten, binding the Peloponnesian states together. There may have been some sort of arrangement that in cases of dispute among them they should not go to war but should refer the question to the Mycenaean king. The only thing, perhaps, that we can confidently say is that, in the case of a common expedition in which he took part, he would be unanimously designated as the commander-in-chief, and when the loot was collected and distributed he would receive the largest or choicest portion. The Pelopids had created a hegemony, which might, in the course of time and in favourable circumstances, have developed into an empire. Their geographical position on four seas counted for much. Besides commanding the whole southern side of the great Corinthian inlet and a sea-route to central Greece (see above, p. 457), Agamemnon had access to the Aegean at Cenchreae, to the western sea and to the southern in Messenia, while his brother controlled the Laconian bay and possessed Cythera, a recognized port of call for Mediterranean traders.

In the particular Achaean states, the king was supreme leader of the host and probably conducted public sacrifices to the gods. His decisions were formed in consultation with a council (*boulē*), and the host or people were summoned to an assembly (*agora*) to hear their decisions, but not to discuss or vote on them. These institutions, we may be sure, were very old; but from Achaean times, at all events, the Council and the Assembly were continuous and universal in Greek history, and supplied the constitutional frame for all the political developments of oligarchy or democracy. In the social organization the unity was the tribe (*phyle*); the tribes probably represented originally independent village communities which had coalesced to form a larger community but retained their individualities. The members of the tribe were themselves organized in phratries (*phratrai*) or fraternities, bound together by common religious rites. The *tribus* and the *curia* were corresponding institutions at Rome.

In the aristocratic societies of the heroic age, in which the common people count for little and are shepherded by their kings, there are no signs of what we should call political thought and few signs of anything like a national spirit. It is the personal

glory of the princes, not the glory of the people, that inspires the imagination. The character of the warfare corresponds. The leaders are much better armed than their followers, and the first object in a battle is the destruction of the enemy's captains. Single combats are therefore one prominent feature in every battle; drill and tactics are rudimentary. Armour is costly, and when a man has slain his foe, he is always determined to despoil him of his armour; so that fights for the armour of the dead are another feature of battle. The Achaeans, it may be observed, wore bronze armour and used bronze weapons, for iron was still scarce and, if it was used for agricultural tools and some domestic purposes, had not yet begun to supersede bronze for instruments of fighting. But they had swords with broad blades which could be used for cutting instead of the old long swords which were only good for thrusting. They wore plumed helmets, breast-plates, and greaves, and shields of two forms were in use, the older, long, oval, rather unwieldy *aspis*, and a new smaller round shield which may have generally gone with the use of greaves. We get some idea of their appearance from the figures of armed men on a painted clay jar found at Mycenae which is known as the 'Warrior Vase.' They had no cavalry, but like the Egyptians they had two-horsed chariots.

The development of society in this age seems to be marked by a certain loosening of the bond of kinship. Strife and homicide within the princely families are common, and it has been suggested that this may signify a period of transition from the cognatic to the agnatic system of hereditary succession. A new bond which tends to replace kinship is that between the prince and his retainers or companions (*hetairoi*) who live with him in his palace. We do not know how they were chosen, but we know that they were sometimes recruited by the refugees we have already spoken of, who had committed manslaughter and fleeing from their own land sought the protection of a foreign court.

In time of peace the prince and his companions hunt and feast, and are regaled by minstrels who sing 'heroic' songs; not only of the past, but of the deeds and adventures of the prince himself and his contemporaries. The ideal enjoyment of an Achaean is to feast while a divine poet is singing. 'There is no more perfect pleasure,' says Homer's Odysseus, 'than to sit in one's place among the banqueters in a palace-hall and listen to a minstrel, when the tables are laden with bread and meat, and the cupbearer draws wine from the mixing-bowl and pours it in the goblets.' Minstrelsy and war were the ruling notes of the age;

it is to the minstrels that it owes its heroic complexion. An important and characteristic thing about their songs is that they were not national. The bards, who sang to the lyre in the 'shadowy hall' of the palace of Mycenae, in the days of Agamemnon or his son, did not confine themselves to Argive story or to the exploits of the Pelopid line. They had a wider outlook. The subjects of their songs were what we should now call international; they ranged over the whole Achaean world, and had a universal interest which enabled them to circulate from court to court. This international interest was promoted by marriages and relationships between the royal families throughout Greece. The sister-in-law of Odysseus in Ithaca was queen at Phœrae; Hermione of Sparta, daughter of Menelaus, married the king of Phthia. These marriages always meant a business transaction; the bride is purchased from her parents but she brings a dowry.

Another international feature in the heroic age of the Achaean world was probably the use of a common dialect by the aristocracy, and that was the dialect used by the minstrels. This language may have even been a *lingua franca* in the Aegean, more or less familiar at the courts of foreign rulers whose native tongue was not Greek. Writing, too, had perhaps become international in the Aegean. A legend which describes a king of Argos sending a written message to a king of Lycia may be true to the actual conditions of the time.

The universal and international character of Achaean feeling was probably reflected in the world of their gods. The gods, to whom they assigned a common home on Mount Olympus on the northern confines of Greece, ceased, for the aristocracy, to be local or even national, and became gods of the whole world, concerned with the distant Ethiopians as well as with their favourite cities in the Aegean; they might love and protect foes of the Achaeans as well as the Achaeans themselves. The Olympian deities—Zeus, Hera, Athena, Apollo and the rest—were freed from local bonds, though the local cults continued; it was a new religious conception which at first can only have affected the religious ideas of the nobility. It is to be noticed that while there are priests of local cults, they play little or no part in society and their influence is small. The public sacrifices did not require the presence of professional priests, they were performed by the king. Seers and soothsayers who predict events from the flights of birds appear to be more important. Oracles, which were to play a remarkable rôle in later history, are already a recognized institution; Achaean chieftains go up to consult the oracle of

Pelasgian Zeus at wintry Dodona, or the oracle of Apollo at Delphi.

It is difficult to believe that it was purely by the labour of their subjects that Achaean princes grew rich and lived sumptuously in their palaces, and that it was entirely by the surplus of Greek produce and industries (pottery, oil, wine) that they paid for the wares that came from Egypt and Caria to the Aegean marts, and purchased from the Sidonian traders, who visited Crete and Cythera and the ports of western Greece, the embroidered cloths, the silver bowls, the slaves, and many other things that were exported from the Phoenician cities.

It seems probable that one of the economic bases of Achaean wealth, as it had probably been of Cnossian wealth, was piracy. In the heroic age the deeds of men who attacked their neighbours for the sake of plunder were considered blameless and glorious. The fictitious story of a Cretan prince who became wealthy by leading numerous expeditions across the seas and returning laden with spoils is characteristic of the time. His last enterprise, a raid on Egypt, was fatal. When the pirates had moored their vessels in the Nile, they ravaged the fields, slew the men, and seized the women and children. But an Egyptian army surprised them and they were themselves killed or enslaved¹. The part which Achaeans took in the attack upon Egypt in the reign of Merneptah had no political motive (p. 475 above); they were simply bent on booty. War in fact was a principal industry of the Achaeans and their warfare was primitive and cruel. Captives were sold into slavery if they were not ransomed. The wives and daughters of kings were taken by their conquerors to be slaves and concubines. Prisoners might be slain and sacrificed at the funerals of Achaean chieftains.

This profitable business could be carried on more successfully and with less fear of reprisals, if the Achaean pirate princes lived in concord among themselves and presented a more or less united front against foreign powers. And after the fall of Thebes the Pelopids seem to have managed to bring about a state of comparative internal tranquillity throughout Greece. Cattle-lifting and local feuds it would have been impossible to abolish in the absence of an authority greater than any king of the time could hope to possess; but the poetical traditions convey the impression of general internal peace, after the Theban Wars, and of friendly relations among the Achaean courts.

¹ The story (*Odyssey*, xiv, 229-522) is told as a fiction, invented by Odysseus, but it was essential that it should be probable and true to the conditions and practices of the time.

II. THE TROJAN WAR

There was no great foreign power to cause terror or apprehension to the Achæan Greeks. The only two great powers within range were the Egyptians and the Hittites. Egypt had never been a serious menace to the Aegean, though peoples of the Aegean had more than once assisted her enemies; and towards the end of the thirteenth century she was not in a position to be aggressive. The Hittites, since the check that Ramses II had inflicted on them at Kadesh (1288 B.C., see above, pp. 142 *seq.*), were obliged to concentrate their power in Syria; western Asia Minor had probably been for some time slipping out of their control. The retreat of the Hittite power was perhaps connected with the invasion and settlement of new peoples in north-western Asia Minor (cf. pp. 248, 268, 547).

In the stream of migration from Europe to Asia across the two straits which form an easy passage between the continents, the earliest for which we have any definite evidence are those of the Dardanians, Phrygians, Mysians and Bithynians. The movements of the first three may perhaps be dated from the sixteenth to the fourteenth century, though some would put them earlier; the Bithynian migration was later than the Trojan war. Portions of these peoples abode behind in the Balkan peninsula, where the names of Dardania and Moesia survived for nearly two thousand years; the name of the Brygoi or Briges in Macedonia, who may have been a remnant of the Phrygians, soon disappeared.

The Dardanians, who evidently crossed by the Hellespont, settled down in the Troad. A portion of them who lived near the straits, in the lower valley of the Scamander, were distinguished as Trojans (*Trōes*), a name which may have belonged originally not to a tribe of their own but to the pre-Dardanian inhabitants of the district. The rest, who inhabited the fertile plain in the middle valley of the river and the northern and western slopes of Mount Ida, retained the Dardanian name.

When the Trojans emerge into the light of history, their civilization is in some respects similar to that of the Greeks. Many of them appear to have had Greek names, and they worshipped Greek deities. Besides Priam and Paris, which appear to be genuine Dardanian names, we find in the leading families Hector, Helenus, Deiphobus, Aeneas, and many others whose names are Greek. In some cases the Achæan minstrels, from whose lays Homer took them, may have Graecized Dardanian names, but it is improbable that all cases can be thus explained.

The tradition, as a whole, points to the conclusion that in the latter half of the thirteenth century the Trojans were in the process of being Hellenized. How did that come about? A simple explanation lies to our hand.

The Dardanians had spread themselves over the northern and central districts of the Troad, but they had not displaced the inhabitants of the southern Troad in the long narrow fertile district which stretches from the Aegean coast along the north side of the bay of Adramyttium. These inhabitants were collectively known as Pelasgians, they included peoples known as Leleges (who may originally have come over from Greece) and Cilices, and seem to have formed a sort of confederacy, bound together by the common worship of the Sminthian Apollo. Their principal towns were Larisa and Chryse on the Aegean coast, Pedasus (the later Assus) and Lyrnessus (probably Antandrus) on the bay, and Cilla and Thebe at the head of the gulf. As we know that the Pelasgians were among the early peoples of north Greece, the simplest inference seems to be that they had crossed the sea and settled in these parts, anticipating by some centuries the later Greek settlements on the eastern coast of the Aegean. They subdued the peoples they found there (Cilices and Leleges) and afterwards became themselves subject allies of the Dardanians retaining a certain amount of independence, and the Trojans intermarried with them. One of Priam's wives was Laothoe of Pedasus; the wife of Hector was Andromache of Thebe.

The earliest mention of the Dardanians is in Egyptian documents of the reign of Ramses II, if we accept this identification of the Dardenui who are mentioned in a list of the peoples whom the Hittites confederated against Egypt. In the Masa of the same list, it has been proposed to find the Mysians, who settled in the eastern Troad in the valley of the Caïcus. Of their associates we might seek the Luka in the Lycians who dwelt east of Mount Ida in the Aesepus valley and had a strong place at Zelea; the Kalikisha in the Cilices of the plain of Thebe; and the Pidasa in the Leleges of 'steep Pedasus' on the bay of Adramyttium. As all these names can without violence be associated with the Troad, there is something to be said for conjecturing that this whole group were mobilized by the Hittites for their offensive against Egypt¹. On the other hand, identifications have been

¹ Since this was written, the same suggestions have been made by Mr W. J. Phythian-Adams, in the *Bulletin of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem*, No. 1. *Ariunna* (which Flinders Petrie equates with Oroanda) he identifies with Ilium, and for another name, *Keshkesh*, he suggests Cyzicus.

suggested which associate these confederates with southern Anatolia (Lycia, Cilicia, etc.); see p. 281 *sq.*

The river Scamander reaches the Hellespont close to its entrance, flowing through the Trojan plain which extends eight or nine miles south-westward to the hills and is bounded on the west by the Aegean. It is possible that the Scamander has changed its course, and that in ancient times it flowed farther east through the ravine of Kalifatli-Asmak. Many centuries before, the Trojan plain had been dominated by a fortress about three miles from the sea, on the end of a low ridge which descends into the plain at the junction of the valley of the Scamander with the small valley of the Simois. Since the destruction of that stronghold (see above, vol. 1, p. 614), the hill of Hissarlik, as it is now called, had been inhabited, but of the three successive settlements which have been discovered the two earliest were mere villages, not the seats of princes but the hamlets of peasants. These were replaced by a larger settlement, surrounded by a wall, but representing the same stage of civilization (the 'Fifth City'). The Trojan princes chose the same ancient site for their residence, and it may have been in the sixteenth century that their fortress arose, the great Troy of legend and history, the seat of Priam.

The preceding fortresses and villages, five in number, which had arisen in the course of more than a thousand years, had raised the hill from fifty to a hundred feet above the level of the sea. The area of the sixth settlement was five acres; it was two hundred yards in diameter. It might have held a garrison of two or three thousand men. To call it a city is misleading; it was a fortress with a royal palace. It was enclosed by a wall of square blocks of stone, twenty feet high, fifteen feet thick, surmounted by a rampart of brick and strengthened by square towers. There were at least four gates of which three have been discovered, one on the east, a second on the south, and a third, which had been built up before the town was destroyed, on the south-west. The fourth, known as the Scaean Gate, was on the north-west, but its remains have not been uncovered. Pottery, the clue to the chronology of ruined habitations, indicates that this impressive stronghold flourished and fell in the Achæan¹ period, while evidence of the same kind suggests that it was founded as far back as the sixteenth century (see above, p. 471). It corresponds perfectly to the description of Troy in the poetical tradition of the Greeks. It was well-walled; it had high gates and fair towers; and the epithet 'wide-wayed' is borne out by what seems to have been an exceptional feature, a terrace, inside the rampart, which

is in some places twenty-five to thirty feet wide. It was destroyed by an enemy; the traces of this are preserved in the levelling of the upper portion of the outer wall and of the walls of houses within.

The Trojan fortress was known as Ilios (the town of Ilus, said to be Priam's grandfather, whose tomb was a landmark in the plain), or Pergamus (the 'citadel'), or Troia, this name being properly that of the whole 'Trojan territory' and then applied specially to the 'Trojan city.' The power of the lords of Troy extended southward, as we saw, over the Pelasgians, and north-eastward along the coast of the Hellespont and Propontis as far as the plain of Adrastea through which the river Granicus flows; across the water they had a European port at Sestus which faces Abydus. They were wealthy. Troy was 'in the mouths of all men as rich in gold and rich in bronze.' Their wealth cannot have come from their own land, for the Scamandrian plain, which was in their immediate possession, had not the fertility of the southern Troad or of the Dardanian lands round Ida. The suggestion has been made that they filled their treasury with toll taken from traders. It has been pointed out that ships were often windbound at the mouth of the Hellespont, and sailors must have been forced to land on Trojan soil to obtain fresh water from the Scamander. The Trojans could have prevented their landing, and thereby have embarrassed and ultimately controlled the traffic between the Aegean and the Propontis. The theory is that by the exertion of such control the Trojan kings were able to establish in their own territory a commercial fair, in which three streams of traffic met, one from the south, from Caria, Lycia and Crete, a second from the north, from Thrace and Illyricum, and a third from the east, from Paphlagonia and beyond. Thus, the products of Aegean lands and the merchandise which reached the Aegean from Egypt and elsewhere could only be exchanged with the products of the north and north-east at this annual fair under the walls of Troy whose king exacted from the visitors a goodly toll.

For this ingenious theory there is no evidence in tradition; there is no vestige, however faint, of the memory of such a yearly fair. It is not to Troy but to Lemnos that our scanty evidence points as a market in the north of the Aegean. Simpler hypotheses may suffice to account for the opulence of the Trojans. Their regular source of income it is natural to find in tribute from their subjects, from their kinsfolk the Dardanian shepherds of Ida, from the Pelasgian princes, and from their north-eastern neighbours of Arisbe, Percote, Pityea and the Adrastean plain. This would, no doubt, have been supplemented by the spoils taken in

predatory expeditions and the pay or gifts they received for aid in war, in an age when war was frequent and a valiant predatory people was in great request as an ally.

There is no evidence that Troy was a sea-power. She must have had some ships to maintain her communications with Lesbos, Tenedos and Sestus, but they played no part in the Trojan War. It has been suggested that she had possessed a fleet which disappeared shortly before the War, and that its disappearance may be accounted for by supposing that Troy shared in the disastrous expedition against Egypt which was launched by a number of maritime peoples in 1194 B.C. The identity of most of these peoples, whose names are given in an Egyptian record, is very uncertain (see above, p. 173), and the validity of the theory depends on the guess that Zakaray means Teucrians, and on the questionable assumption that Teucrians (which never occurs in Homer) was used at that time to designate the Trojans¹. It appears, therefore, to be extremely doubtful whether the Trojans were among the sea-rovers whom Ramses III 'trapped like wild-fowl,' destroying or capturing their ships. The probability is that if Troy had a naval establishment it amounted to very little. She had relations with distant lands overseas, for instance Cyprus and Crete as well as Mycenae, but there is no evidence to show that what she got from those lands was borne in Trojan bottoms.

It was perhaps towards the beginning of the twelfth century that the great War, which for the later Greeks was a chronological era, broke out between the Achaeans and the Trojans. The best known of the dates computed by Greek chronologists was 1192 B.C. The story is that when Priam was king of Troy and Agamemnon ruled at Mycenae, Paris, son of Priam, visited Sparta and seduced queen Helen, the wife of Menelaus, and carried her off to Troy. To recover Helen and avenge the wrong, Agamemnon invited all the princes throughout Greece to join in a common enterprise. Virtually all obeyed his summons. Their fleets assembled at Aulis in Boeotia, and sailed to Troy. Besides Agamemnon, who was commander-in-chief of the whole armament, and his aggrieved brother Menelaus, the principal chieftains who took part were Achilles, son of Peleus, king of Phthia, Odysseus king of Ithaca,

¹ See p. 283. The absence of *u* in the Egyptian form makes the identification unimpressive. And if after all Teucrians are meant, they must have been Teucrians of Cyprus, for the Teucrians of the Troad were probably immigrants from Cyprus at a period later than the Trojan War. The earliest mention of them in Greek literature is in a poem of Callinus (early in the seventh century B.C.).

Diomedes of Argos, Nestor of Pylus, Idomeneus of Crete, Ajax of Salamis, Ajax of Locris. They drew up their ships on the shore near the mouth of the Scamander and remained encamped on the Trojan plain for nine years, during which Troy, to whose aid allies had come, defied all their efforts to take it.

The allies who went to the help of Priam were numerous. There were first of all his near neighbours, immigrants from the north like his own people: the Mysians who dwelt in the valley of the Caïcus and the Phrygians who had settled in the valley of the Sangarius. From beyond that river came Paphlagonians; and from still farther east the Halizōnes of Alybe, who were probably within the Hittite empire¹. Then there were the three principal peoples of the Aegean coastland south of the Troad; the Maeonians of the basin of the Hermus, the land which was later to be Lydia, the Carians who cultivated the rich valley of the Maeander and had a flourishing town at Miletus, and farther south, the Trmmlis, or Lycians whose geographical position, just round the corner, fitted them to be intermediaries for the trade of Egypt and Phoenicia with the Aegean lands. Lycians and Carians were indigenous peoples of Asia Minor, the Maeonians were probably, like the Trojans themselves, immigrants from Europe. Finally, from Europe came Thracians, Cicones who lived on the north Aegean coast under Mount Ismārus, and Paeonians from the banks of the river Axios.

After a nine years' struggle between the two confederacies representing the powers on either side of the Aegean, Troy was taken in the tenth year by the device of the 'wooden horse,' which the Trojans were induced by a stratagem to drag within their fortress. At night, the Greeks who had sailed away, ostensibly abandoning their enterprise, returned and the heroes who were concealed within the horse opened the gates to them. The city was sacked and demolished.

This is the outline of the tale. That the immediate occasion of the war was the abduction of a princess is quite in keeping with the character of a heroic age, and there appears to be no very good reason why it should not be accepted as a historical fact. But the significance of the war transcended the personal incident which occasioned it; and, as in the case of most considerable wars that are attended by important consequences, there were deeper interests underlying the conflict. Mycenae and

¹ See Allen, *Homeric Catalogue*, 160. Alybe has been explained (Sayce) as the 'land of the Halys'; and the 'source of silver' mentioned by Homer refers to the silver mines of Mount Taurus.

Troy were the two great powers on either side of the Aegean, and the incident of the rape of Helen may have only hastened a clash of arms which was probable sooner or later. The fact that Agamemnon was able to rally all Greece to engage in his expedition and that auxiliaries came from many quarters to Priam's help might suggest that more was involved than the recovery of a woman. It is probable that for the Achaean princes the hopes of plundering a city renowned for its wealth and looting the cities of its subject lands were the direct incentive. For the Trojan allies the immediate inducement was the pay which Priam was able to promise them from his well-filled coffers; the poets who sang of the war did not omit to notice the fact that this hire was a great drain on the king's treasury. But in a war on this scale it may be assumed as probable that there were larger interests behind.

It has been suggested that the definite object of Agamemnon and his host was to open for free traffic the gate between the Aegean and the Propontis, of which the Trojans have been represented as the churlish and grasping keepers, by destroying the fortress which overlooked the entrance to the Hellespont. This view is bound up with the hypothesis, already mentioned, of an annual fair at Troy, for which there is no evidence. And, in general, it is not likely that the war was connected with commercial interests. When we look for motives in harmony with the character of a heroic age and based upon what we definitely know of the situation, we notice on one hand that the actual result of the war was to open to the Greeks a new field for permanent settlement in the coastlands of Asia Minor, and on the other that the need of such a field for expansion had already made itself felt among the Achaean aristocracy. We have seen how adventurous Greek princes, for whom there was no room at home, had established themselves in Rhodes and other islands near Caria and Lycia, and how others in the north had gained a footing in Lemnos. Colonization, in fact, had already begun, due not to over-population of Greece in a general sense, but to over-population among the noble and princely families. That the movement could take the direction of the coasts³ of Asia was a consequence of the retreat of the Hittite power, but it must have been looked upon with apprehension by the peoples of the coast, the Lycians, the Carians, the Maeonians, and the Dardanians¹.

¹ To the Lycians Rhodes must have seemed a dangerous Achaean outpost; it is significant that in the poetical tradition the Rhodian leader Tlepolemus fights with the Lycian Sarpedon and is finally slain by him

Without supposing that Troy announced a kind of 'Monroe doctrine' for preserving the eastern Aegean for the peoples in possession, it is easy to understand that there was a general consciousness, which the men of the time had no political formula to express, that there was a real conflict of interests between the powers on either side of the sea; that a personal incident could therefore easily lead to a grave war; and that when such a war broke out the peoples of Greece and the peoples of the Asiatic coast both felt the community of their interests.

With the details of the war the poets took ample liberty. Its duration may be taken as legendary. Nine years, nine days, are recurring, conventional lengths of time in Greek stories, and it is difficult to believe that a large host could have been induced to remain through nine successive winters away from their homes, which were within a few days' sailing distance, encamped in tents on the Trojan plain. And we find that the poetical story itself betrays the truth. All the leading incidents it has to tell about the war are condensed into the ninth year and the tenth in which the fortress fell. The first eight years are a blank. Here we have the mythopoeic imagination at work, making the siege long in order to enhance its wonder, and instinctively fixing its length by the conventional number nine. Another exaggeration which we can test is the size of Troy. The actual site shows that it could not possibly have held, as the poems imply, the whole Trojan army (the allies and subjects as well as the Trojans themselves) numbering, as one passage indicates, about 50,000. From the Homeric Catalogue we learn that the Greeks sailed in 1176 ships, of various sizes, but even if that were a correct figure, we could not deduce their numbers¹.

For an army operating on hostile soil at the entrance to the Hellespont it was necessary to have a base for supplies, and Lemnos is marked out for this use. This island, which was inhabited by a people 'of savage speech,' called Sinties, was ruled by a king of Greek birth, Thoas, son of Jason the Argonaut.

¹ The capacity of the Boeotian ships was 120 men; that of the ships of Achilles and Philoctetes 50. Taking the capacity of all the others to be only 50, we should get 62,300 as the lowest estimate of the total strength, a figure far exceeding the strength of the Egyptian armies that invaded Syria (see above, p. 67). Compare Thucydides, I, 10, 4. It has not been observed that any calculations of this kind are vitiated by the fact that the ships had to transport horses and chariots as well as men. Another Homeric passage states that the Greeks outnumbered their enemies in the proportion of ten to one; and though this is rhetorical, it may embody a genuine tradition that the Greeks were numerically superior.

For ships making for Troy across north Aegean waters, it must have been a regular station for anchoring at night. The tradition did not pass over the rôle which it played in the war. The Greek fleet rested here on its voyage out; we may suppose the ships at anchor in the bay of Mudros. Thoas played the part of a friendly neutral. The Greek camp by the Scamander was supplied with wine from Lemnos, and captives made during the siege were sent to the Lemnian slave market. Imbros seems to have been useful to the Achaeans in the same way.

Of the events which occur in the poetical tale there is one which we may fairly take to be historical because it is likely to have happened in the case of any expedition of the kind and is thoroughly characteristic of the heroic age. A portion of the Greek forces under Achilles made a great raid on the southern Troad, sailing up the bay of Adramyttium, sacking the towns of the Pelasgians, and lifting the cattle of the Dardanians from the pastures of Ida. In the same way a descent was made upon Lesbos, which, under king Macar, was dependent on Troy, and the principal town (Lesbos, perhaps the later Methymna) was captured. The little island of Tenedos off the Trojan coast was part of Priam's kingdom, and it too supplied its contribution to the plunder which the Achaeans secured in food and metal and women. All this was the obvious thing to do, and the Achaeans could not have failed to do it. The success of their operations must have seriously crippled the resources of their enemy. But it also, according to the story, led to a dissension in the Greek camp, which endangered the success of the expedition—the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, which Homer took as the subject of the *Iliad*. This too may be a true incident. Quarrels over the division of spoils and the allotment of concubines must have been familiar occurrences in the heroic age, and may often have compromised the fortune of a war.


It has been proposed to explain the tale of the wooden horse as preserving the recollection of the actual use of some sort of siege engine, such as the Greeks in later history regularly employed¹. However that may be, it is highly probable that the decisive assault was made on the west side, in the neighbourhood of the Scaean Gate, where the wall was weakest. This is a point in which the ruins of the city bear out in a curiously striking way a tradition about its building². The west wall is thinner and inferior in its masonry to the southern and eastern, and was probably built first. Now that fact was preserved by the minstrels:

¹ Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 35. ² See Leaf, *Troy*, p. 159.

the section of wall near the Scaean Gate was the most vulnerable place in the circuit where the besiegers had the best chance of scaling it. Legend attributed the building of the fortification to the gods Poseidon and Apollo, and their work was impregnable; but a mortal, Aeacus, helped them, and the portion he built had the weakness of mortal work.

With the fall of Troy, the one strong military power which could effectively oppose their enterprises on the Asiatic coast was removed from the path of the Achaeans. The fruits of this first great victory won by the united efforts of Greece were gathered in slowly during the next two generations. Troy itself was for the time left desolate, but a series of settlements in the Troad and southward towards the river Hermus soon began. Tenedos, Antandrus, Cilla, Cyme, Pitane and other places were colonized, and above all Lesbos became a Greek island with cities which in the future were to be distinguished and prosperous.


This movement, which followed directly from the Trojan War, was known as the Aeolic migration; the region over which the colonization extended was afterwards to be called Aeolis, it was really a new Achaea. We may suppose that the Aeolians, whose name does not occur in early documents, were an Achaean people; the Greek genealogists derived most, though not all, of the principal Achaean families from Aeolus the eponymous ancestor of the Aeolians. We have no satisfactory material for the history of this early colonial enterprise which began the Hellenization of Asia Minor, to be discussed in chap. xx. In conducting it the Pelopids, according to the tradition, played a leading part: first, Orestes, the son, and then Penthilus the grandson, of Agamemnon. Orestes had increased his father's dominion by marrying his cousin Hermione the daughter of Menelaus, and so inheriting Sparta, and by the acquisition of Argos. He was succeeded by his elder son, Tisamenus, with whom the dynasty of the Pelopids came to an end through the restoration of the old Perseid dynasty by descendants of Heracles, which probably preceded by a generation or two the Dorian invasions with which the Greeks of later times closely associated it. Another son, Penthilus, had turned his eyes to the region which his grandfather had made accessible to colonial adventure. He colonized Lesbos. It was in these colonies beyond the sea that, when the Achaean kingdoms were overwhelmed by the barbarous Dorians, the memories of their achievements were preserved by the minstrels who migrated with their princes from the palace halls of Mycenae and Argos, Sparta and Pylos to new homes on Asiatic soil.



PLAN OF THE PLAIN OF TROY

TABLE SHOWING RELATIONSHIP OF THE PELOPIDS TO THE PERSEIDS

Names not mentioned in Homer are in Italics



THE TROJAN ERA

Dates of capture of Troy according to Greek Chronologists

Duris: B.C. 1334.

Herodotus: *c.* B.C. 1250.

Parian Chronicle (*Marmor Parium*): B.C. 1209-8.

Timaeus: B.C. 1194-3.

Eratosthenes: B.C. 1183 (so Castor, Apollodorus, Africanus).

Sosibius: B.C. 1171-0.

Ephorus: B.C. 1136-5.

¹ Sthenelus II, who took part in the Trojan War (above, p. 479), was son of Capaneus, who was great-great-grandson of Proetus brother of Acrisius. Proetus and Acrisius were great-grandsons of Danaus.

CHAPTER XVIII

HOMER

I. THE HOMERIC POEMS

ALL that we know of the Achaeans is derived directly or indirectly from early Greek epic poetry, and almost entirely from the two principal epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which alone have been preserved. Since these poems were not, on any theory, composed till about three centuries after the Trojan War, the natural place for considering them and the questions associated with the name of Homer might seem to be not here but at a later stage of our history. There is, however, a good reason for anticipating chronology. The Homeric poems tell us almost nothing directly about the history of their own age. It is the civilization of the Achaean age they reflect; and the view we take of Achaean Greece is so closely connected with the view we take of the poems that it is desirable and convenient to treat them together.

Of the two epics the *Iliad* is the historian's principal source. Its subject is a short but critical episode, extending over about six weeks, in the ninth year of the siege of Troy. Chryses, the priest of Apollo at Chrysa in the Troad, had offered Agamemnon a ransom for his daughter Chryseis, who had been taken captive, and on Agamemnon's refusal he had prayed Apollo to avenge him. The god sent a plague upon the Greek army which ravaged it for nine days. Then the Greeks held an assembly convoked by Achilles, and the seer Calchas declared that the plague would not be stayed till his daughter was restored to Chryses. Agamemnon was forced to consent, but he insisted that Briseis, another captive who had fallen to the lot of Achilles, should be delivered to him instead. High words were spoken, and a deadly quarrel ensued between the two kings. Briseis was delivered, but Achilles retired to his tent and refused to fight. His mother, the sea-goddess Thetis, persuaded Zeus to avenge him by giving victory to the Trojans, so that the Greeks, reduced to dire straits, might honour him again and make amends (Book 1). The wrath of Achilles and the consequences of this decision of Zeus, twelve days after the outbreak of the quarrel, form the thread of the story.

Homer was not a playwright. He was the creator of the spacious epic, and his epic conception, if the term may be used, was not that of a poem in which the interest is concentrated, as the dramatist concentrates it, exclusively on the one *motif* which gives it its unity and on a few central figures—Achilles, Agamemnon, Hector, Patroclus—and in which nothing is admitted that does not bear more or less directly on the *dénouement*. Such was probably the conception of the small pre-Homeric epic, but the epic on the grand scale conceived by Homer was to be a composition in which the interest is extended to the whole background and environment. The means for combining this design with a dramatic plot was *delayed action*, and one of the principal functions of the gods who play such a large part in the *Iliad* was to provide devices for delaying the movement which conducts from Agamemnon's repulse of Chryses to the deaths of Patroclus and Hector.

After his promise to Thetis, Zeus does not intervene immediately, and a long day is occupied with events which serve to make the prominent heroes familiar to the audience, to enumerate the forces on both sides, and to show how the gods and goddesses espoused sides in the war. Then the Greeks dig a trench and build a wall to protect their ships. All this occupies about a quarter of the whole poem (Books II to VII). Zeus at last takes action by forbidding the Olympians to intervene. The Achaeans are so hard pressed by the Trojans that Agamemnon consents to make overtures to Achilles and offer him handsome reparation, but he is not pacified and still refuses to fight (Books VIII, IX). During the following night Odysseus and Diomedes steal out from the Greek lines to reconnoitre the camp of the enemy, capture a Trojan spy, Dolon, learn from him of the arrival of a Thracian chieftain, Rhesus, with beautiful white horses, and steal the horses (Book X). From this point the poem keeps more closely to the theme—the consequences of the quarrel. A long day of fighting ensues in which after varying fortunes the Trojans reach the Greek ships and a decisive Trojan victory seems inevitable (Books XI to XV). The interest in this continuous fighting is skilfully sustained, particularly by the devices which the gods employ to evade the command of Zeus to abstain from helping either party. Moved by the extreme peril of the Greeks, Patroclus, the bosom friend of Achilles, implores him to go to their rescue. Achilles refuses, but allows Patroclus to fight and lends him his own armour. Patroclus restores for a while the Greek fortunes, but is at last slain by Hector and despoiled of the armour, and a fierce battle rages over his corpse (Books XV to XVII). The desire

of avenging his friend and slaying Hector overcomes the anger of Achilles against Agamemnon; Hephaestus, the divine smith, at the prayer of Thetis, forges new armour with a shield of wonderful design for Achilles (Book xviii), and on the following day Achilles routs the Trojans and slays Hector (Books xix to xxii). The poem concludes with the burial and funeral games of Patroclus and the visit of Priam to the tent of Achilles to ransom Hector's body (Books xxiii, xxiv).

The *motif* of the *Odyssey* is not 'historical.' Its subject is the adventures of one of the heroes of the Trojan war, Odysseus (Ulysses), king of Ithaca, in returning home from Troy, and his vengeance upon the suitors of his wife, Penelope, who had for years been feasting in his palace and devouring his substance. Many of his adventures in strange lands and seas are derived from folk-tales which originally had nothing to do with him and are woven by the poet into an enthralling story.

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were only two, though they were the greatest and longest, of a whole series of epic poems which were composed in the course of about three centuries (c. 900 to 600 B.C.). This body of epic poetry was in much later times known as the *Epic Cycle*, which, arranged chronologically, was supposed to furnish a history of the world from the marriage of Heaven and Earth down to the end of the generation of the heroes of the Trojan War. In the Trojan section of the Cycle the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had their places. The first poem was the *Cypria*, which told of the causes of the war: how at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, which was attended by the gods, Discord threw a golden apple as a prize for the most beautiful goddess; how Paris awarded the apple to Aphrodite, and carried off Helen; how the Greeks sailed to Troy. The story is taken up by the *Iliad*, and continued in the *Aethiopis*, which described the deeds and death of the Amazon queen Penthesilea, the slaying of the Aethiopian king Memnon by Achilles, the death of Achilles at the hands of Paris and Apollo, and the quarrel of Odysseus and Ajax over his armour. Next came the *Little Iliad*, which carried the story down to the construction of the wooden horse, and the *Sack of Ilios*, which described the capture of the city and the departure of the Greeks for home. This was followed by the *Nostoi*, or Homeward Voyages of the heroes, telling of the adventures of Agamemnon, Menelaus and Neoptolemus, son of Achilles; then the *Odyssey*; and finally the *Telegonia*, of which the subject was the death of Odysseus at the hands of Telegonus, his son by Circe.

There was also a Theban section in the Cycle, including three

poems, the *Oedipodeia*, the *Thebaid* concerning the first, and the *Epigoni* concerning the second, Argive expedition against Thebes.

In early times some of these lost epics were attributed by some to Homer. We find his name alleged as the author of the *Thebaid* as well as of the *Cypria*. But the final result of Greek criticism was that while the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were ascribed to Homer, who was supposed to have lived not later than in the ninth century, the others were associated with various successors, mere names (Stasinus, Arctinus, Lesches, Hagias, Eumelus), to whom dates were assigned in the eighth century. As to the latest, the *Telegonia*, there was a general consent that its author was Eugammon of Cyrene, who must be placed towards the end of the seventh century. Of all these works only a few lines survive. They were a mine of material for later poets and artists; they furnished the plots of many of the plays of the Attic tragedians. That they were all posterior to the *Iliad* is certain, for they presuppose it. It is quite clear that the *Cypria* was designed as an introduction to the *Iliad*; and the *Aethiopis*, of which the reputed author was Arctinus of Miletus, said by tradition to have been a pupil of Homer, was joined directly on to the last verse of the *Iliad*. The *Sack of Ilios*, attributed to the same author, is really a continuation of the *Aethiopis*. The *Little Iliad*, which in the order of the Epic Cycle is interposed between them, overlaps with both; it is not a link in the chronological chain, but rather a rival continuation of the *Iliad*.

Besides epics, some other works were ascribed to Homer, especially a number of hymns in honour of gods, which are still known as the Homeric Hymns, though they must belong to a later age than the *Iliad*. In one of them, the hymn to Apollo, the author speaks of himself as 'the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle.' This was taken as a proof that Homer lived in Chios. Several towns claimed to be his birthplace. An examination of the traditions about his life points to the conclusion that he may have been born at Smyrna and, though he was not the blind old man who wrote the hymn, may have lived at Chios. If the 'Homerids' of whom we hear were, as some think, originally descendants of Homer, who formed a school of rhapsodes with a continuous tradition coming down from the Homeric age, some facts about his life might have been preserved. But these traditions are treacherous ground.

II. THE HOMERIC CONTROVERSY

From the time when Athens, in the course of the fifth century, became the literary centre of Greece, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were studied and elucidated from many points of view. In the third century B.C. at Alexandria a penetrating philological and historical criticism began, but though many verses and a few longer sections were rejected as not from the hand of Homer, no doubts were raised as to the unity of the poems, and the opinion of a few that the two epics were by two different poets was confuted and soon forgotten.

It was not till the seventeenth century A.D. that the theory was put forward that neither of the epics was the creation of a single brain. The Abbé d'Aubignac wrote his *Conjectures académiques* in 1664, in which he argued that Homer never existed, that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* consist of a number of independent songs or hymns, which were first collected by Lycurgus at Sparta in the eighth century B.C. and afterwards re-collected and arranged in their present order by Pisistratus at Athens in the sixth. He concentrated his attention on the *Iliad*. French critics had for some time back been disparaging Homer and pointing out that the *Iliad* was full of offences against logic and good taste, in order to conclude that the greatest of the ancient poets was inferior to the greatest of the modern. D'Aubignac agreed with their premisses but drew a different inference. These defects did not exist, he said, in the original poems; they are due to the process of joining together compositions which were not intended to cohere. He considered it one of the chief blots of the *Iliad* that whereas the opening lines lead us to expect that the deeds of Achilles are to be the principal theme, it is only in the last quarter of the poem that he is the leading figure on the stage. He supported his theory by the argument that the Greek tradition (recorded by Josephus), that the epics were composed without being written down and were transmitted by memory for many centuries, refutes itself. How could a poet have made thirty thousand verses and communicated them to others without writing? He would have had to spend his whole life in repeating them, and others their lives in learning them. D'Aubignac indicated that the *Iliad* could be broken up into forty original independent lays.

In this essay, which was not published till 1715, we have the germs of the Homeric heresies of the nineteenth century. The question of writing, which was to play its part in the controversy, was brought to the front by Robert Wood in his *Essay on the*

Original genius of Homer (1769), which attracted attention throughout Europe. Wood presented a number of arguments to prove that writing was unknown to the Greeks in Homer's day and was not generally practised till the sixth century B.C. But he did not argue like d'Aubignac. He did not question the possibility of composing and transmitting a poem of fifteen thousand verses without the aid of writing, and he believed in Homer as the single author of both epics.

The theory of d'Aubignac, which had not been taken very seriously, and was almost forgotten, was revived by a German professor, F. A. Wolf of Halle, in his *Prolegomena* to Homer (1795). This famous book kindled the controversy which has raged ever since and still divides the world of learning, and Wolf has always been acclaimed as the father of modern Homeric criticism. He was only its foster-father. His book does not contain any new or original idea. He got the substance of his theory from d'Aubignac, and the material for the question of the antiquity of writing from Wood and a French scholar, I. B. Merian, who had accepted and developed Wood's view. Like d'Aubignac he dealt only with the *Iliad*, and his theory was more cautious. It may be summarized as follows:

About 950 B.C. Homer, a poet of genius, composed a number of songs on the Trojan war, other poets followed him and added new pieces. These songs were handed down orally by reciters (rhapsodes) and on their lips underwent considerable change. They were first written down at Athens in the time of Pisistratus, and further changes were made by learned critics who revised them. The greater part of the songs may be attributed to Homer himself, but it is impossible to distinguish them from the rest. The apparent unity of design which has deceived the world is due to the artifices of compilers and editors (diasceuasts).

The *Prolegomena* made the world realize that Homer was a problem, and initiated an intensive study of the poems which has continued ever since. This study was stimulated and helped by the simultaneous recovery of Alexandrine criticism, through the publication of the ancient scholia preserved in a Venetian manuscript, by Villoison in 1788, of which Wolf was able to take advantage. Thus two Frenchmen, d'Aubignac and Villoison, are the true parents of the Homeric studies of the nineteenth century.

Many theories dissecting the *Iliad* were put forward during the next sixty years. Lachmann propounded a theory which is little more than a repetition of d'Aubignac's. Homer disappears altogether and the poem is dissected into eighteen independent

lays. But this extreme form of dismemberment found little favour, and most of the heretical views are of a different type, leaving room for an original Homer and contemplating a primary long poem which was gradually expanded. Before Lachmann wrote, Hermann (1832) had indicated the direction in which future research would move, by postulating two fairly long original epics composed by Homer—the *Wrath of Achilles* and the *Return of Odysseus*—to which compositions of other poets were subsequently added. But Grote's hypothesis of the growth of the *Iliad* was the first example of a plausible theory of expansion. Homer, who lived not later than in the early part of the eighth century, using older lays, composed an epic which was strictly confined to the wrath of Achilles, and consisted of Books I, VIII and XI–XXII of the present *Iliad*; a later poet expanded this 'Achilleid' into an *Iliad* by adding Books II–VII, IX and X; and Books XXIII, XXIV were added still later. Book IX, although it deals with the *motif* of the Achilleid, is excluded from it because it seems to be unknown to the poet who composed Book XVI (see *vv.* 52–60). Grote considered the *Odyssey* the work of another poet of the same age.

Expansion of this kind by successive poets and 'arrangers' (diasceuasts) is the common feature of the views of all the constructive critics who deny the unity of the *Iliad*, ever since Grote. Most of them agree, and differ from Grote, in regarding Book VIII as a late insertion, and the description of the shield of Achilles as an addition to the original poem. Most of them separate the story of Dolon and the steeds of Rhesus (Book X) as the work of a late rhapsode. The Catalogue of the hosts in Book II has been assigned to the seventh century B.C. And when at last the *Odyssey*, which had escaped the dissecting knives of Wolf and Lachmann, was attacked with remarkable ingenuity by Kirchhoff (1859), the latest of the three poets, whom he postulated for its composition, was credited with more than nine of the twenty-four books and lived about 660 B.C.

At the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century there seemed to be a general consent that the *Iliad* was a patchwork wrought by many hands. Among leading philologists, unitarians were few and appeared to be fighting for a doomed cause. Since then, however, there has been a striking revulsion of opinion and now, if the tide is not setting definitely in the other direction, there is at all events an increasing number of critics who believe in an original unity of authorship and design.

The most recent, and perhaps it is destined to be the last

important, attempt of critics who are in the line of Hermann's succession to show that the *Iliad* is the work of several poets and assumed its present form by a process of expansion, may be noticed¹. It is highly complicated, but only the general outline need be given.

The original *Iliad*, which was composed by Homer, consisted of (1) Books I–VII (to v. 321); (2) XI–XV; (3) XVI to XXIII (to v. 256); and (4) a concluding portion which has been lost. For it did not end with the death of Hector, it ended with the death of Achilles. It differed in plot from the present *Iliad* in that Patroclus did not wear the armour of Achilles, and Achilles did not wear the armour made by Hephaestus. In section (3) there have been extensive changes, and a great deal is not Homeric. For a second poet came, not very long afterwards, who conceived the idea of introducing into Homer's epic an older poem describing the wonderful shield made by Hephaestus. In order to make this possible, he devised the *motif* of the exchange of armour, and to him must be ascribed almost the whole of Book XIX and the greater part of Book XVIII. Two other radical changes were made by rhapsodes of later times. One incorporated an old independent lay, Book IX, dating perhaps from the Homeric age, and a much later poem, Book X; and in order to do this and connect them with the plot he composed Book VIII. The other change was the substitution of the present ending, the ransoming of Hector's body, for the original ending, the death of Achilles (which was transferred to the *Little Iliad*). Homer's original epic was only partly his own work. For instance, Books II–V and much of Book VI consist of older lays which he incorporated, supplying the connections.

This analysis is subtler and more penetrating than any of the similar theories which preceded it. Much of the reasoning is based on considerations of difference in style. One general remark may be made. We might admit the cogency of some of the principal arguments without drawing the inference that the *Iliad* is the work of three or four different poets. We might accept the reasons adduced for the hypothesis of an older plot in which there was no exchange of armour and yet not accept the intervention of a second poet. For a poet who is working out a plot does not always give it from the beginning its final form. A new idea may occur to him; and he may alter and re-shape and, being human, inadvertently leave some traces of the first shape. Similarly the fact that a passage in Book XVI ignores the episode of Book IX

¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer*.

(on which Grote, as we saw, insisted) may prove that Book ix was interpolated after Book xvi, but does not prove that the interpolator was not Homer himself. In fact, the true value of this analysis may be that it gives us a glimpse into Homer's workshop and helps us to understand how he built up his poem.

It may be said of all the disintegrating theories which deny the original unity of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey*, and attribute them to several successive rhapsodes, that so far as they are based on literary criticism they start with certain surprising postulates. It is assumed that if the *Iliad* were the work of one great epic poet, it would be entirely free from inconsistencies or contradictions or irregularities in style. It is assumed that an early Greek epic poet would have taken the same view of his art as some of the best story-tellers of modern times, and not allowed the action of the main plot to be delayed by excursions and episodes which are not strictly relevant to that. These axioms are an inheritance from d'Aubignac and the theories of the seventeenth century A.D., and thus overtly expressed would have been disowned by many of those who have employed them. But without postulates of this kind the case against the unity of the poems, from the literary side, disappears.

The arguments from language which are adduced to show that some sections of the epics are later than others, and which have formed one of the principal reasons for assigning the *Odyssey* to a considerably later age than the *Iliad*, are exceedingly precarious. There is clear enough internal evidence that the *Odyssey* was composed after the *Iliad*, but differences which have been noticed in vocabulary, syntax, and style do not furnish any cogent proof that they cannot belong to the same age or to the same author. The poems differ in subject, tone and atmosphere. There is occasionally a mock-heroic vein in the *Odyssey*, which would be out of place in the *Iliad*. There seems to be no good *a priori* reason why the same age should not have produced two poems in one of which—a tragedy—the language and manner of older heroic lays were more closely preserved, while in the other—a 'tragi-comedy'—the poet allowed himself a larger latitude in introducing 'modern' words and modes of speech and even occasional colloquialisms. In general, the criterion of language has been used by innumerable critics for distinguishing earlier and later poems in a way which would be justified only if we adopted the postulate that the poet of the oldest parts emptied into his work all the poetical vocabulary of his age and all the resources of contemporary grammar, so that any words or usages

or constructions not found in those parts must belong to a later period. Nor does there appear to be any sound reason for denying the common authorship of the two epics¹. The poet of *Hamlet* and *Lear* is also the poet of the *Merchant of Venice* and the *Tempest*. The poet of the *Iliad* shows in the Olympian scenes that he is a master of comedy.

Another argument for the view that the *Odyssey* must be comparatively late is that some of the fairy tales in the adventures of Odysseus seem to have been originally located in the unexplored seas to which the Hellespont was the gate, though a later tradition located them in the western Mediterranean. Therefore, it is argued, the story must be later than the exploration of those regions by the Ionians of Miletus. There can, however, be little doubt that, long before Homer, vague knowledge and reports about the Pontic coasts had come to Greece. If we accept the fact that the Achaeans went to the shores of the Hellespont, it is preposterous to deny that they ever heard of the perils of the seas beyond, or that the legend of the sailing of 'the Argo, known to all the world,' could be older than Homer. The argument is as convincing as that which infers a considerable interval of time between the two poems from the fact that the Sicels of Sicily, who are mentioned in the *Odyssey*, do not happen to be named in the *Iliad*. In the latter case the suppressed major premiss is the proposition that the author or authors of the *Iliad* intended it to contain a complete inventory of their geographical knowledge—another of those surprising postulates which infest the field of Homeric controversy.

With our present information, the following conclusion seems to be reasonable. The age of Homer was hardly later than the middle of the ninth century. The composition of short epic lays in hexameter verse, for recitation by rhapsodes, had begun long before. The art had been perfected, the metrical instrument refined, certain conventions established, when Homer conceived and executed the idea of a long epic with a central theme. He composed, probably at Chios, first the *Iliad*, and then the *Odyssey*. His material consisted of the older lays. These lays were themselves based on more ancient songs which had come over to Asia Minor with the Greek colonists from their old homes in Achaean Greece, songs which had been composed by court-minstrels and sung to the lyre in the palaces of the Achaean princes, celebrating

¹ If we admit the single authorship of each of the epics, it is difficult not to ascribe both to Homer. If there had been two poets equally great, the names of both would surely have been remembered.

the deeds of themselves and their fathers. The art of the rhapsode or 'song-stitcher' who took the place of the minstrel was perhaps an invention of Ionia. There are some indications that the rhapsodes in transforming the tales of the minstrel into a new metrical shape purified them of grossness and brutalities which did not suit the taste of their own times, but they reproduced the features of the heroic age as they were reflected in the songs. They were fully conscious of the difference between the Achæan civilization and their own, and any contemporary traits that crept in were incidental and negligible in the general picture. Throughout both of the epics there are a number of minor interpolations, but of considerable additions there are none that can be regarded as certain.

In the Achæan age writing was an old and well-known art. The Cretans, like the Hittites, Babylonians and Egyptians, could keep their accounts and correspond, and during the great period of Cretan domination the practice must have spread throughout the Aegean lands. But it was a writing without an alphabet; words were represented by signs (*sēmata*), and Homer is careful to avoid any reference to the later writing with letters (*grammata*). In casting lots each hero makes a sign of his name on the lot; and in the story of Bellerophon, which Homer relates, the king of Argos corresponds with the king of Lycia by signs on folded slips of wood. We cannot doubt that here the poet is deliberately true to the fashion of an earlier age. Though the use of alphabetic writing on stone or metal cannot be traced in Greek lands farther back than the seventh century, it seems to be probable that the Greek alphabet was constructed at a much earlier period (before 900 B.C.), and that, long before it was used for monumental purposes, it was employed in the ordinary business of life. We may conjecture that the recent introduction of this convenient instrument helped to make it feasible for Homer to construct a long epic poem.

But, if he used writing for the purpose of composing and preserving, his work was not designed to be read, except by rhapsodes. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, like the short epic lays which preceded them, were designed to be heard. One remarkable canon of Homeric art illustrates how the poet was governed by the practical conditions of recitation. He excludes simultaneous actions except on a small scale. He would have found it easier to construct the plot of the *Odyssey* if he had allowed himself to tell successively, as story-writers commonly do, two series of events supposed to have been going on simultaneously. But thus told,

the story would not have been so easy and clear for an audience to follow, as when the chronological sequence was uninterrupted, especially as the recitation must have occupied several sittings. The skill with which the *Odyssey* is constructed, where two separate arguments, one in Greece and one in distant seas, are worked into a chronological continuity in which there are no regressions, is a striking exhibition of Homeric technique.

The language of the epics has played a large part in the Homeric controversy and various answers have been given to the question, in what particular dialect the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed. It need not be considered here except in so far as it touches the relation of the epics to the old Achæan songs. For the present purpose we may divide the numerous dialects spoken in Greece in later times into two large groups, Dorian and non-Dorian. It is only the latter that we have to consider. It includes Ionic, Attic, the pre-Dorian language of the Peloponnesus which survived in Arcadia and was carried to Cyprus, Thessalian, Boeotian, Aeolic. The last three are usually grouped together as 'Aeolic'; but Aeolic in the special sense means the speech of the Asiatic Greeks of Aeolis in north-western Asia Minor, including Lesbos, and we know it only in its Lesbian variety. The poems of Homer show a mixed language which in its main characteristics is Ionic but has certain well-marked Aeolic traits and possibly an admixture of Attic.

We must remember that the rhapsodes, reciting Homer in successive ages and in various cities, would naturally modify the epic language to some extent, to make it more easily intelligible to their audiences, both in Ionia and in Attica. In this way we may explain the Attic forms, if such existed. To explain the 'Aeolisms' a bold theory was proposed which, though it has failed to convince, deserves mention, because it contributed to the illumination of the problem. According to this view, the poems were originally composed in Aeolic—the language spoken in Smyrna and Cyme—and were at a much later time (sixth century B.C.) translated into Ionic so far as the metre would allow. The Aeolisms of the resulting text are recalcitrant forms which had to be retained because the Ionic equivalents were unmetrical.

It is on other lines than this that the artificial epic dialect is probably to be explained. The non-Dorian dialects seem to be all regional developments corresponding to a common tongue which was spoken throughout Greece by the higher classes during the heroic period, and in which the Achæan minstrels composed their songs. The epic poets of Ionia, while they wrought in Ionic

as it was spoken, say, in Chios, took over much of the vocabulary of the old songs; and as some of the Achæan forms survived in Aeolic and not in Ionic, what appeared to be Aeolisms are really archaisms. We must remember that of the old Ionic as spoken in Homer's day we know nothing (apart from the epics themselves); it certainly changed considerably during the following centuries. It is quite conceivable that in Homer's age the speech of Smyrna and the speech of Chios were nearer each other than in later times.

The vocabulary, then, which Homer and the rhapsodes fixed as a common norm for Greek epic poetry for fourteen hundred years to come was, we may take it, partly based on the vocabulary of the Achæan songs which had been brought over from Greece, and contained many old words which had dropped out of common speech, and some of which Homer himself hardly understood the original signification. They were retained because they were at once mysterious and metrically convenient¹. To the later Greeks these 'Homeric glosses,' as they were termed, were problems for the philologist. Such for instance were some epithets of the gods, like *argeiphontes* of Hermes, *tritogeneia* of Athena; the curious epithet of men, *merôpes*; perhaps phrases like *νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ*, of which the general meaning, 'in the dark of night,' was clear enough. The bronze *keramos* in which the god Ares was enchained would not have been intelligible, if that word, in its sense of 'prison,' had not happened to survive in the Cypriote dialect.

III. HISTORICAL TRADITIONS IN THE *ILIAD*

The sceptical attitude towards the literary tradition about Homer which prevailed throughout the last century was generally accompanied by scepticism as to the historical traditions about early Greece and the Trojan War which underlie the epics and had formerly been supposed to be substantially historical. Few accepted the Trojan War as a fact; there was incredulity even as to the existence of Troy. This scepticism was not principally due to the Homeric controversy; it reflected the opinion of the age as to historical legend generally. A great deal of the epic story is obviously mythical; it seemed safe and scientific to consider it all

¹ In regard to the digamma (*w*), which in the epics is sometimes metrically operative and sometimes not, the simplest explanation may be that in Homer's day it had ceased to be pronounced by the Ionians, but that the poets, influenced by the old rhapsodes, retained its metrical effect when it was convenient to do so, though in reciting they would not pronounce it.

mythical. The excavations in Greece and the Troad, and then in Crete, rendered this attitude untenable. They provided a new and unexpected commentary on Homer. The wealth of Mycenae, the walls and towers of Troy, the importance of Crete were found to be facts, and a civilization was revealed in the Aegean lands which corresponded partly to the heroic age depicted in Homer, partly to an age still older.

The Trojan War has been thereby lifted definitely out of the realm of myth. For, on the one hand, we have a strong fortress on the traditional site of Troy, corresponding in age to the traditional age of the Troy of Priam, and evidently destroyed by an enemy. On the other hand, we have the firm Greek tradition, older than the eighth century, of a war of the Achaeans with the Trojans. These are two facts which raise two questions. How was the great fortress on the Hissarlik site destroyed? And what gave rise to the tradition of the Trojan War? The hypothesis that the tradition is true that the Achaeans assailed and conquered the Trojans is a simple and complete answer to both questions, and is therefore justified. Can we go further in extracting history from the legendary matter in which it is embedded? What about the heroes themselves, Agamemnon, Achilles, Priam, Hector? Did they ever live, or are they pure inventions?

To answer this question, and in general to discover the historical value of the epics, we are helped by a method of comparison. Other peoples as well as the Greeks had their heroic ages with the heroic poetry which is the reason for naming such ages heroic; for instance, the Germans, the Slavs, the Celts. In some of these cases we have the means of criticizing and interpreting the poetical traditions, because some of the historical facts on which the imagination of singers and story-tellers was employed have come down to us in the sober contemporary records of neighbouring peoples who were in a more advanced state of civilization and wrote dry chronicles of events. Immensely as such ages differ in details, certain common features emerge from a comparison¹. The most instructive is the heroic age of the German peoples of central Europe, in which, from the fourth to the sixth century A.D., they were in a state of unrest, engaged in preying upon the Roman Empire and seeking abiding homes to settle in. Different as the circumstances were, this German society had much in common with the Achaean. An analysis of the Teutonic poetry shows that the principal heroes whose deeds bards celebrated were real men whose names are written in the

¹ Chadwick's *Heroic Age* has made such a comparison possible.

true history of Roman records and chronicles, such as Theoderic, Hermanric, Gunther, Attila. The poetry of other heroic ages agrees, so far as we can control it. It is therefore a probable presumption that the origin of the poetical figures, Agamemnon, Menelaus, Helen, Achilles, Priam and the rest, is to be explained by the simple supposition that they were men of flesh and blood who played their parts on the stage of history. We are entitled to believe that if the Aegean area had been in as close geographical contact with the Egyptian Empire as the Teutonic world was with the Roman Empire, some of these names might have occurred in the historical monuments of Egypt. No other supposition carries any conviction.

The historical reality of the heroes is indeed forced upon us, unless we deny that the epic tradition was based on the songs of the court-minstrels whose favourite themes were the deeds of the men of their own time and their fathers. But, as longer narrative poems succeeded the older short lays—a development common to Greek and Teutonic poetry—chronology was not always observed; men of different generations might be brought together as contemporary. This was the case in Teutonic legend; and it may have been so in Achæan legend. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that all the heroes whose fame in the poems ‘ascends to heaven’ are the men whom a historian, had a historian existed, would have selected as politically the most important. Some of these may have been of minor interest for the poet, or may have been forgotten; for in the poetical world and in the actual world, even of a heroic age, the values were not entirely coincident.

There are some reasons, however, for thinking that the imagination of the old Greek singers kept, in certain ways, more closely to fact than that of the Teutonic bards. One reason is the extraordinarily accurate picture of the topography of the Troad which is preserved in the *Iliad*. Imagination is at work but it confines its activity within strict limits. In the *Odyssey*, too, we have a view of the topography of the Ionian islands and their relation to the mainland which is perfectly true to fact, with the sole exception that Ithaca is imagined too far out to the west. Again, there are not wanting signs that generations were more scrupulously distinguished in the Achæan tradition than in the Teutonic, which was capable of representing leading men of three successive generations as contemporaries. The truth is that one of the chief differences with which we must reckon in using the analogy between these two heroic ages is the immeasurable

superiority of the Greeks in the art of poetry; and their art, which reached its perfection in the two epics, implies an intellectual, lucid, and discriminating method in grasping and handling the material that we do not find in the cruder poetical narratives of the Teutonic bards. It may be added that no legitimate deductions can be drawn from a comparison of the Homeric poems with the *Chansons de Geste* on the age of Charlemagne, for there was no epic tradition connecting that age with the eleventh century A.D. in which the *Chansons* came to birth, and the literary conditions of their transmission were entirely different.

The comparison of heroic ages lights up the fact, which archaeological discoveries established, that the epic or Homeric age is long posterior to the heroic age. Homer lived in the age of iron. That metal had become plentiful and cheap, and was universally used instead of bronze for weapons, armour, and many other purposes. The epic poets were well aware of this difference, and they adhered consistently to the testimony of the old poetry in which bronze was the common metal and iron still rare and dear. It is only in a phrase that does not affect the story or the picture—such as ‘the mere sight of iron lures men to fight’—or in similes, that the ‘modern’ note might occasionally be struck and the consistent archaism violated. This conscious and consistent archaism is indeed a feature of the Homeric poems which it is most important for the historian to grasp. The trumpet was not used to call to battle in the heroic age; Homer mentions it once, but it is in a simile, and this serves to emphasize his pains in avoiding anachronisms. He carefully preserves such features as the use of the two-horsed, not of the four-horsed chariot—and this, again, is mentioned only in similes; the absence of cavalry and the rare use of riding; the old marriage custom of bridal gifts offered by the suitor as the purchase money of the bride; the practice of roasting, not boiling, meat; the fact that fish was not eaten by the well-to-do except in cases of dire necessity. His description of an Achaean palace is not taken from the houses of his own time; to understand the arrangements of the house of Odysseus we must go to the palace on the acropolis of Mycenae. In the halls of the princes poetry is not recited by rhapsodes holding a staff; it is sung by minstrels playing on the lyre.

This clear consciousness and scrupulous observation of the distinction between Homer’s own period and the Achaean are shown particularly in the geographical framework of his picture. The Greek settlements in Asia Minor, the cities of Ionia and Aeolis which he knew himself, do not appear at all. The Aeolian

name is never mentioned. The name of the Ionians—'Iāvones with trailing dresses'—occurs once to designate the Athenians, and the mention of Dorians in Crete (in the *Odyssey*) need not be an anachronism, betraying that the poet lived after the Dorian conquest of the eleventh century, since it is quite possible that in the heroic age there were already Dorian settlers in Crete¹. Miletus is still a Carian town. The Achæan geography of Greece is faithfully preserved, a geography which lasted only for a few generations, and was quite different from that of the poet's own time and from anything that anyone had the least temptation to fabricate². Homer could not only not have invented the older geography, but he could not have kept it so pure from later elements unless its general lines had been fixed firmly and clearly in the poetical sources from which he drew.

Those poetical sources, from which Homer gathered what he needed, must have treated of many traditions and legends of the heroic age besides those relating to the Trojan War. He found occasion to relate briefly some of them. To many others he refers incidentally and it is only from later writers that we learn the stories, but we are justified in believing that they descend from pre-Homeric tradition. For there is no reason to think that the appearance of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* meant the disappearance, immediate or speedy, of all the older rhapsodies. The short epics which existed about the death of Achilles, for instance, and the capture of Troy, must have continued to be recited up to the latter part of the eighth century B.C., when they supplied material to the poets who were then, in imitation of Homer, writing longer epics, Arctinus and the rest. Thus the traditions current in later Greece about the heroic age, and derived from the epic poems of the eighth and seventh centuries which we do not possess, came through these epics from that very ancient material which was used by Homer, and so depended ultimately on Achæan lays.

There are, naturally, some features in the Achæan society Homer portrays about which we cannot be sure whether they are heroic or Homeric. His Achæans, for instance, dispose of their dead by incineration. But the general practice in the earlier ages of Aegean civilization, as we know from many tombs which have been excavated in many places, was simple inhumation. Two different views have been held. On the hypothesis that the

¹ Compare below, p. 528. But the passage in which the name occurs (xix, 175-7) is a parenthesis which interrupts the grammar and may be an interpolation (though it is difficult to see why it was introduced).

² This point is worked out convincingly in Allen's *Homeric Catalogue*.

Achaean invaders from the north, it has been supposed that they brought with them the new custom of cremation. But no proofs of this practice during the Achaean age have been found in Greece. Some burials have been discovered in which fire was applied to dead bodies, but no cases of the reduction of the bodies to ashes. The other view is that cremation was not an Achaean custom, but, being a prevalent practice in Ionia in Homer's time, was imported into the heroic age by him. Interments of cremated bodies have been found in a graveyard in Caria at Assarlik (between Halicarnassus and Myndus) dating from pre-Homeric times. Again, we may have doubts whether the *chiton* or tunic, eastern in name and origin, which is worn by men in the *Odyssey*, was really a garment of Achaean days, or was bestowed upon them by Homer from the dress which he and his Ionian contemporaries wore. He followed his poetical sources probably in his description of the gold cup of Nestor, for a cup of similar though less elaborate design was dug up at Mycenae; but we cannot say whether the metal-smiths of the heroic age ever wrought upon shields such scenes as Homer imagined to have been depicted on the shield made in the Olympian smithy for Achilles, or whether he took the idea from works of his own time.

A few words may be said on the Olympian machinery in the *Iliad*, which raises a question of a similar kind. It has been held that the action of the gods invalidates the view that historical facts underlie the epics. It would be absurd 'to deduct the supernatural element and claim the whole residuum as historical fact.' That is true. But the presence of the supernatural element does not affect the question as to the historical events which lie behind and in the epic narrative. It has been argued: 'Homer says that Achilles slew Hector with the aid of Athene. We are not entitled to omit Athene and still to affirm that Achilles slew Hector.' If we cannot affirm that Achilles slew Hector, it is not because Athene, in the poet's story of the slaying, aided Achilles. We cannot affirm it, because we do not know the limits which Homer's predecessors allowed themselves in moulding historical motives for the purposes of their art, and therefore, without some independent evidence, we can draw no certain inference. But in the larger case of the Achaean siege and capture of Troy, though Zeus and the whole Olympian assembly are involved, we have independent archaeological evidence and conclude that we have to do with a historical fact. The Olympian machinery does not compromise the historical kernel of the story.

That machinery, as contrived and used by Homer, served two purposes in the economy of the *Iliad*. It gave him, as was already observed, a means which could be used for delaying the action, a necessity in his epic design; and it gave him a means of relieving the tension, an artistic necessity in epic poetry as well as in drama. For the first purpose, the gods are to be taken seriously, they guided the course of events. For the second purpose they play comic rôles, and the Olympian interludes perform the same functions as the comic scenes in Shakespeare's tragedies, providing opportunities for the poet's humour to relieve the tension. The gods are represented as high and solemn beings when, for instance, the poet declares that 'the will of Zeus was being fulfilled' or describes Apollo as 'walking like the night.' But their aspect is different when Zeus displays a malicious pleasure in seeing the members of his family fall upon each other or when Apollo declines to fight with Poseidon, or when Ares, wounded by a mortal, complains bitterly to Zeus, who is perfectly unsympathetic, and then, healed and washed, sits enthroned by his father's side 'exulting in his glory.'

It can hardly be questioned that the action of the gods was elaborated by Homer's personal art and that the relations of Zeus with his very troublesome family and the individual characters of the deities were imagined by him. The question that may be asked is whether he obtained hints for his treatment from the older poetry. Homer puts on the lips of one of the court-minstrels in the *Odyssey* a song on Ares and Aphrodite surprised in adultery by Hephaestus, which plays with Olympian society in the same light, irreverent spirit in which he treats the gods in the *Iliad*. That is not conclusive, for he might have done this without any warrant from tradition. But it may seem probable that the general lines of the division of the gods into two parties, Achæan and Trojan in sympathies, were fixed for Homer and not due to his own invention. And it may also seem probable that the general conception of the Olympians, which meets us in Homer fully developed, was formed in Achæan times, because analogy suggests that the character and atmosphere of the heroic age were favourable and congenial for the growth of the conception of the great gods independent of local interests. In this respect we are tempted to believe that the 'theology' of the epics reflects the ideas of the heroic age and was preserved in the Achæan minstrels from which it passed to the Ionian poets.

The Homeric question is a literary question, but it is one of which the interest transcends the special history of literature.

The student of general history cannot pass it by, not merely because the two epics are our principal source of information concerning the Achæan age, but because it is not a matter of indifference for our view of the growth of Greek civilization, whether we believe in one Homer, architect of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, who lived not later than in the ninth century, or divide the authorship among a number of Homeruli of various epochs from the ninth to the sixth. The former view, adopted in this chapter, means that one of the very greatest and most characteristically Greek men of genius lived in Ionia at a very early stage in Greek history, and created a new form of poetry, the long epic, built up with the same kind of architectural skill which sculptors in later times would employ in pedimental compositions and lyric poets in building their odes. He was unsurpassed in thrilling narrative, and a memorable speech of Achilles (*Iliad*, ix, 308 *sqq.*) displays his power as a master of passionate rhetoric. He might have excelled either in tragedy or in comedy, if he had been born in the fifth century B.C. at Athens. In the history of the Greek people it must stand out as a fact of supreme interest that four hundred years before the age of the great Attic poets, Greece had produced one who was their peer—those poets would themselves have said their superior—and whose creations were always to be imminent over the worlds of Greek art and thought.

CHAPTER XIX

THE DORIANS

I. THE TRADITIONS: LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

THE Heroic Age is well typified for us in Achilles, in the early doom that hangs over him, and the great renown he shall win first. This double destiny is the opening theme of the world's greatest poem: but a historian may put it more brutally and say, the Achaeans were living on their capital. The Homeric chief counted his wealth by the number of generations it would last: the richest hoped it might last for ten. Our traditions say, in the second generation after Agamemnon the deluge came.

It came, the ancients said, in the form of the avenging Heraclids, come back to regain the heritage of their ancestor Heracles. It is not clear how far the peoples they brought with them were regarded as barbarians from outside. The most famous of the Heraclids, Temenus and his brothers, led the Dorians into the south and east parts of Peloponnese; another, Oxylus¹, crossing with them at Naupactus, led the Aetolians into Elis; and in the same generation, yet other Heraclids led the Thessalians into the land called thenceforward Thessaly. These last dispossessed the Boeotians, who thereupon moved into Boeotia, and thus almost all the heroic world was swamped. The dispossessed Achaeans were pushed into corners: the extreme south of Thessaly, the extreme north of Peloponnese; only Arcadia and Attica were left undisturbed. Many who had lost their homes, so the Athenian writers tell us, found a refuge in Attica, especially the Ionians, who had dwelt on the north coast of Peloponnese, and from Attica swarmed out across the Aegean, occupying the islands and the central part of the coast of Asia Minor opposite. Parallel with this Ionian exodus moved other streams, to left and right. To left, on the north, the Aeolians from Thessaly crossed to Lesbos, and the corresponding coast of Asia Minor; while to right the Dorians, whom Peloponnese could not hold, spread over Crete and the islands of the Cretan Sea, Rhodes and the south-west corner of Asia Minor.

¹ Oxylus is only a quasi-Heraclid, and does not come into the story till the fourth century B.C. See p. 531.

Such are the essential lines of the story of the Great Migrations. Most of this story is already presupposed in the fifth century writers, notably Thucydides and Pindar. It was apparently completed and reduced to order by Ephorus. Finally, the chronographers put a date to it: the Dorian invasion took place in the year 1104 B.C.

The naïve curiosity of a growing people must be answered by a certain simplification of history, and here is a conspicuous instance: the rhetorical historians of the fourth century B.C., the second childhood of Greek literature, took up the game only too gladly. Thucydides was aware of the difficulty of an accurate chronology for these semi-mythical times. In his introduction he seems to imply a date not much earlier than 900 B.C. for the Dorian invasion; yet later, referring to the Dorians of Melos, a 'Spartan Colony,' he says they had been there continuously since the twelfth century. When Thucydides speaks with this uncertainty, Ephorus and Eusebius do not carry much weight. Until other evidence than that of the ancient texts was available, there was no justification for picking out this or that part of the tradition, and calling it history. But the labours of the last few generations of scholars have brought many other lines of evidence into play, the most important being the evidence of *language*, and of the *material remains*.

These will help, both of them, to establish the reality of the invasion: the second, to establish its chronology.

It is possible to make a reasonably complete map of the distribution of dialects in Greece in the fifth century. Subtract the areas in Sicily, the Black Sea, and elsewhere, which were made Greek in the great expansion of the eighth century and later, and there is left a fair picture of the condition of Greece at the end of the Migrations¹. The Aegean islands and west coast of Asia Minor are divided, from north to south, among Aeolians, Ionians and Dorians. On the mainland Doric is spoken in the south and east of Peloponnese; and a dialect, closely akin to Doric, covers the greater part of the remainder. It is blended with Aeolic in Thessaly and Boeotia; it covers Epirus, and all of central and southern Greece, except Attica and Arcadia. The story of the Migrations seems to receive confirmation and extension. Dorians, Aetolians, Thessalians, all appear to be part of a great infiltration, which can be traced back as far north-west as

¹ A fair picture. But when do the Migrations end? If we count as part of the Migrations such things as the Ionizing of Smyrna and Halicarnassus, and the Dorizing of Messenia, it is a very fair picture indeed.

Epirus, and which covered all the mainland, and only left untouched Attica and Arcadia.

The dialect evidence is good. The division of Greek speech into the old Aeolic, Ionic and Arcadian dialects, on the one hand, and the 'conquest' dialects on the other, is beyond reasonable doubt. The Greek dialects were not, like the Romance languages of Europe, first differentiated during the Dark Age which succeeded the invasions; a notable instance to the contrary is the survival of the Arcadian dialect in Cyprus. The Arcadians cannot have gone to Cyprus much later than 1000 B.C.; it was, at any rate, before the alphabet reached Greece. There was very little subsequent communication between Cyprus and Arcadia; yet in the fifth century, the dialects, in spite of different systems of writing, are still recognizably the same and markedly different from all others. One may compare the survival of Roumanian among the Vlachs, or of Spanish among the Salonica Jews.

The dialect evidence is important. It makes it very probable indeed that all the elements of this Thessalian-Aetolian-Dorian wave had, if not a common ancestry, at least a common *provenance*. This has led some scholars to speak of the 'conquest' dialect as 'Dorian in the widest sense,' and loosely of the whole Migration movement on the mainland as 'The Dorian Invasion.' This has the convenience of brevity, but it was not the ancient use. To call the ruling class in Boeotia or Thessaly, or the men of Elis, Acarnania, or Epirus, 'Dorians,' would have meant nothing to a Greek. To him the Dorians were a clearly-marked unit. They dwelt in Argos and Corinth and Sparta, and round the Cretan Sea and the south-west corner of Asia Minor, and sent out their colonies thence. Of all the vast penumbra which we have added to this body, one tiny community only, 'Doris' at the foot of Mount Oeta, near the Malian Gulf, was included by the ancients in the Dorian name. Yet, whatever name we may give to it, the distribution of the dialects points to one large, loosely-connected movement, beginning from an area beyond the range of Mycenaean culture, and following roughly the great geographical feature of which Pindus, Taygetus, Crete and the Lycian hills are elements.

II A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

The legends generally imply that this invasion ended the Mycenaean empire, and produced a new political map, which in its main lines was the same as that of the fifth century (see chap. xx). An almost complete lack of information as to any event

before 800 B.C. suggests that the invasion was followed by a Dark Age, an ebb of civilization. Thucydides expressly infers this for Sparta. Archaeology, which restored to us the Mycenaean empire, has made real this Dark Age also. After the Mycenaean civilization, and before the first faint signs of the Renaissance in the eighth century, have been found remains of a culture, stagnant and primitive, which is called, from the prevalent style of vase-painting, *Geometric*. The name is expressive enough when we contrast, on the one hand, the freehand naturalistic drawing of a Cretan vase, on the other, a figure on an Attic bowl by Euphronius. Compared with these, a Geometric vase reveals its kinship with the Geometric ornament which occurs almost universally among primitive peoples, and had already occurred many centuries before, on the Greek mainland. The decoration seems to rise, not from any need of expression, but from a mere *horror vacui*. On the other hand, the technique in a fine Geometric vase is by no means primitive: the potter did what he wanted with his clay, the painter with his brush: and what is more important, we may perhaps trace the definite aesthetic contribution which Geometric culture made to mature Greek art. The Maeander pattern and panelled system which the finest Attic vases inherit from Geometric times mark a new sense of form disciplining the capricious freedom of Cretan art. Nothing is more typical of the transition from Mycenaean to Geometric art than the change of vase-shapes. Whereas a Mycenaean vase swells at the shoulder and tapers to its foot, its Geometric successor drops its centre of gravity and swells at the belly or lower. The loss in grace is hardly compensated by the gain in stability: but the gain is clearer when we compare the broad-bottomed Doric pillar with the taper-footed pillars of Cretan palaces.

Finally, Geometric art marks the break up of that unity which the Mycenaean empire had given to Greece. A late Mycenaean vase is much the same in Crete or Athens, or even Sicily. In the Geometric period we find that multiplicity of local styles which remained so marked a feature of Hellenic art. The finest was the Attic Geometric, usually called the Dipylon style; and there are well-marked varieties in Crete, Argolis and Laconia. The ~~last~~ is well represented at the temple of Orthia at Sparta, a beautifully stratified site, which gave the excavators good grounds for dating the appearance of the style as far back as the tenth century B.C.

Geometric pottery is not the only phenomenon which marks the end of the Mycenaean world. There was apparently a change in dress, and the new fashion had to be fastened by safety-pins or

brooches. There was an intrusion of new sword-types, capable of cut as well as thrust; and, both for these swords and for other purposes, a copious supply of iron now first became available: it is the end of the Bronze Age¹.

Some of these things begin before the Dorian Invasion. The Achaeans of Homer wear brooches and are well acquainted with iron, in small quantities. But it is so very uncertain how far Homer's picture of the Achaeans is contaminated by later conditions, that we must have independent evidence if we are to divide the remains of the early Iron Age between Achaeans and Dorians. It is, in fact, a question of chronology. If we could resolve this major question, the minor one, as to how far the Geometric culture is a spontaneous degeneration from Mycenaean, and how far it is intrusive, would fall into its place. The importance of the minor question lies in this: Geometric seems to be the result of the Dorian Invasion, and is so far intrusive; but in Arcadia and Attica, countries to which the Dorians never penetrated, it also occurs, and is, so far, spontaneous.

The Mycenaean empire spread a version of Cretan culture over a very wide area, to Cyprus and Sicily and Thessaly. Throughout this area the culture is singularly uniform: and this favours an attempt to fix the date when the transition from Mycenaean to Geometric begins. The transition becomes marked in some graves in the island of Salamis, and some others in east Crete. Certain indications suggest a date round about 1200 B.C. For instance, the type of sword in the Cretan graves reappears in Egypt in the reign of Seti II.

The distribution of this early Transitional style is very wide: it recurs *e.g.* in west Peloponnese, Cephallenia, Thessaly, Rhodes. It is evidently due to no catastrophic change; its dependence on Mycenaean, of which it is essentially a very impoverished form, is clear. On the other hand, it contains sufficient germs of the later Geometric style to induce the Salamis excavator to name it 'Proto-Geometric.' This is the first step in the transition to Geometric. To what is it due? Not to any northern invasion at this moment. Its occurrence, apparently simultaneous over so wide an area, points to some agency operating from within, not peacefully (we are in the mid heroic age which was no time of peace) but without marked rupture. It is a symptom of that period of waste. The northern element is due rather to some infiltration

¹ It is wise at present to draw no conclusions from the practice of cremation. Its traces are by no means easy to recognize, and its recorded instances defy classification.

which had begun long before. Already in the fifteenth century, when Grey Minyan goblets were still used all over Greece, an intrusive Geometric culture occurs at Lianokladi in the Spercheus valley, lasts a little while, and then disappears. There must be other cases of which we know nothing, for the fact of northern intrusion, bringing in the heroic age, cannot be doubted. The Lianokladi culture was absorbed: some of the Thessalian vases of our early transitional period bear unmistakable marks of its influence. The little leaven, constantly reinforced, leavens the whole lump; about 1200 B.C. we see its first widespread results.

The transition lasts a very long time. The accumulated capital of Mycenaean civilization took many generations to waste. At first, it is fairly uniform throughout the wide area it covers; then it begins to split up. The action of the Dorian Invasion seems to be the final breaking down of communications, which leaves the northern leaven free to work itself out separately in every valley of Greece. This lack of uniformity makes it far harder to date the end of the transition than its beginning. True Geometric pottery begins at different times in different places; but at no site can it be put much earlier than 1000 B.C. and at very few sites so early.

A map of the transitional sites recalls both the Greek catalogue in the *Iliad* and the later distribution of Geometric pottery. The style is a symptom of the Heroic Age. The Dorian Invasion is probably to be put at a period of peculiar destructiveness, shortly before the appearance of true Geometric, sometime in the eleventh century. A new political map is created, of which the Homeric poems know little or nothing.

The *Brooch*, or safety-pin, is certainly intrusive in the Aegean. Perhaps it developed, out of the straight pin, among the 'Terremare' settlements south of Lake Garda. The close-fitting dress of the Minoan folk did not need to be fastened by these means: the intrusion of the brooch means the intrusion of a more primitive dress and its wearers. The earliest or 'Fiddle-bow' type, very like the modern safety-pin, is found just before the early transitional pottery, and in the graves at Salamis. Many other types develop during the period of transition; perhaps the most important is the 'Spectacle' brooch, in which the upper part of the brooch forms two large flat spirals of wire. This form, with elaborations, is especially common at Sparta, and was evidently worn by the Dorians; whether by them exclusively, it is impossible to say.

Iron was not unknown in the Aegean of the Bronze Age. It was a precious metal, laid up in a king's treasury, or worn for

rings and bracelets. 'Iron,' says Homer, 'of its own power draws a man onwards.' It was probably credited with magic properties, due to its magnetic power, and perhaps to the blood-like dust of haematite, which, when burnt, turned into iron. It was called in Egypt the 'metal of heaven,' and perhaps its origin was meteoric. About the thirteenth century it was better known, radiating from a point in eastern Asia Minor, perhaps the Chalybes of the Greeks. A mutilated letter from a Hittite king, addressed perhaps to Ramses II, promises to send shortly a supply of iron and encloses an iron dagger as a foretaste (p. 272). The weapons of the host of Ramses III in the twelfth century are possibly of iron, being painted blue on his monuments.

But all this while it remains exceedingly rare in the Aegean: it has not come in at the beginning of the transitional period. The earliest iron weapons in the Aegean are in east Crete, in the early transitional period. Soon after, they appear in Thessaly, in the Dotian Plain, and at the end of the transitional period they are abundant at Tiryns and Athens. This agrees well with Greek tradition. To Hesiod (who was interested in the coming of iron, and rightly places the heroic age in a mid space between the Bronze and Iron Ages) was attributed a poem on the Idaean Dactyls; he appears to have located them in Crete and called them the first workers of iron.

The Cretan iron appears in a type of sword which comes from the north: a type designed to be made in iron rather than bronze. But it is possible that these swords of northern type were made of the Asiatic iron¹, and that the new and copious supply, which the northerners opened up, as their peculiar gift, for the Greek lands, had not yet begun. To this new northern source we should at least ascribe the iron of the tenth-century graves at Tiryns and Athens.

To sum up. From the fall of Troy to the beginning of Dorian Sparta is at least two centuries (say 1180-950 B.C.)². Between them comes the long transitional period when the material resources of the Aegean are wasting, the communications gradually breaking, the craftsmanship declining. The direction taken by this degenerating culture is largely due to a slow but steady intrusion from the north, which can be noted already in the fifteenth century in the Spercheus valley; and, while the communications still hold, this makes itself felt throughout the

¹ As a similar sword from Egypt certainly is: it bears the cartouche of Seti II.

² The present writer would put the fall of Troy considerably earlier.

Mycenaean world. About 1050 a more than usually destructive period begins: the Thessalian sites almost all die out, as also does the Corinthian port at Korakou. Mycenae is burnt, the lower town at Tiryns is destroyed and turned into a cemetery; conversely at Argos, the old Deiras cemetery is turned into a place of habitation. This is the coming of the Dorians, and judged by the material remains, their effect is almost wholly negative—they destroyed much and brought nothing. The breakdown of communications resulted in many different local developments of art, the finest precisely in Attica, that old centre of culture which the Dorians never overran. Perhaps they brought the new supply of iron, and if so, it will be interesting to note the early instances of it in east Crete and the Dotian Plain. The brooch, and the loose garment it implies, had preceded them, for the Dorians did not come to a land of strangers: their 'conquest' dialect, and the old Aeolic and Ionic speeches before them, are dialects of Greek.

III. THE DORIAN TRIBES

We have been speaking of Dorians in the loose sense, including under that name such quasi-Dorians as the Thessalians and Aetolians. The Dorians in the strict and ancient sense, with whom we are chiefly concerned, have certain distinctive common features, making them a well-defined unit among the Greeks. These are the festival of the Karneia, the cult of Apollo Pythaeus, and, above all, the division into the three Doric tribes, of Hylleis, Pamphyloi, Dymanes. This threefold division was held to be so typical of the Dorian race that an epithet casually bestowed on them by Homer (*τρίχαικες*) is already interpreted in a fragment of Hesiod as referring to it¹.

A distinguished scholar has said 'the Dorian Invasion is a modern invention: the ancients speak only of the return of the Heraclids,' and he proceeds to show that the latter is fiction². The remark is untrue, but it has a spice of truth. The *argumentum ad invidiam*, with which critics have met this wholesale rejection of Greek tradition, has been too much used; the tradition, it must be confessed, is largely artificial, and bristles with difficulties and contradictions. It may be divided under three main headings: (a) Homer, (b) other Greek writers before 400 B.C., (c) Greek writers after 400 B.C. The last is mostly negligible.

¹ Or to the three kingdoms of Peloponnese? The Hesiodic line (fr. 8, Kinkel) is not clear. The three tribes certainly were recognized as, and were, a mark of true Dorians.

² J. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, I. i. (2nd ed.), ii p. 76.

The writers of the second, and most important class, are concerned with the Dorian invasion, for they saw in it the beginnings of the Greece in which they lived. Herodotus' famous division of the Greek people into two races, Hellenic and Pelasgic, comes very near to the modern division according to 'conquest' and 'pre-conquest' dialects: though no one now would be prepared to adopt his names and involve himself in their obvious difficulties. The distinction between the 'settled' folk, of whom the Ionians were typical (Herodotus' Pelasgians), and the 'very migrant' people, of whom the Dorians were typical (his Hellenes), is welcome as a piece of sound observation. The account of the Dorians' wanderings is more difficult; here Herodotus passes from observation to tradition.

They start, he says, in Phthiotis, in the time of Deucalion: that is, before Dorians were a distinct unit; under Dorus their eponym, they move to the north of Thessaly, under Ossa and Olympus; thence, shortly before the Trojan War, they moved into Pindus, and there bore the name 'Makednoi'; thence into Doris (the small district under Mount Oeta which the true Dorians regarded as their metropolis or old home; Herodotus says, it was called Dryopis when they arrived); and thence, lastly, to Peloponnese. In Peloponnese they received the name 'Dorians,' and so, became a distinct people¹.

This tale reappears elsewhere in connection with the name of king Aegimius and the Heraclid Hyllus. It is wise to keep it quite distinct from a very different tale concerning the Heraclids. The naïve inventions of our third class of writers, with their profusion of oracles, three-eyed men, etc., we can ignore. But Herodotus has given us an account of the Heraclids' defeat on the Isthmus, before the Trojan War, at the hands of an Arcadian king Echemus, whom Hesiod knew as Agamemnon's brother-in-law. After their defeat they covenanted to stay away for 100 years, that is three generations; the Spartan genealogies show that the covenant was kept. Three Heraclid brothers, the sons of Aristo-

¹ Herodotus I, 56. One cannot paraphrase so famous a passage without ignoring innumerable objections. Dryopis is certainly very nearly the same as Doris. 'Shortly before the Trojan War' is combination. Herodotus says that they were ousted by Cadmeians, and, elsewhere, that Cadmeians passed through north Thessaly when the Argives took Thebes, one generation after Eteocles. The exact locality of the north Thessalian sojourn is unimportant. Pindus is certainly not the alleged town in Doris, we could more easily conceive it as another town (alleged by Scholiasts) in Perrhaebia; but it is, beyond reasonable doubt, the mountain range, both here and in Pindar's First Pythian.

machus, led them in this second attempt.¹ They then divided their conquests into the three kingdoms of Argos, Sparta and Messene. The two tales are not perhaps in formal contradiction; but they are widely different in character, and the second is probably worthless¹.

Now Herodotus has carefully kept both the Heraclids and Aegimius out of his Dorian tale. But Pindar, in several passages, tells us that the Dorians, who came from Pindus to the conquest of Peloponnese, were descended from Heracles and Aegimius. There can be no doubt that the ancient scholiasts are right: Pindar is here accepting the legend that, of the three Dorian tribes, the Hylleis were descended from Heracles, and the Pamphyloi and Dymanes from Aegimius. Who Aegimius was, and how the fusion took place, are further questions, Pindar's views on which we cannot tell. A poem called *Aegimius* is ascribed to Hesiod, and was possibly the source of the Pindaric doctrine; though the few fragments we possess deal with anything rather than the migrant Dorians. For further light on Aegimius we have to turn to our third class of authors, and they have two separate stories, in which we can recognize two of the Herodotean sojourns: one, that Aegimius was a king in north Thessaly, and fought the Lapiths; the other, that he was king of the Dorians in Doris. One of these draws doubtless from the same source as Pindar, but which?

The story which locates Aegimius in north Thessaly is possibly to be preferred². Diodorus makes Aegimius a son of Dorus, and ruler of the Dorians in Histiaeotis; he thus carefully connects him with Herodotus' northern sojourn. Aegimius, at war with the Lapiths, offers Heracles a third of his kingdom, if he will help him; Heracles accepts the offer, and kills Coronus, son of Caeneus, the Lapith king. When Heracles dies, both tales agree that Aegimius keeps his promise by adopting Hyllus to a third share with the sons of his body, Pamphylus and Dymas, whence sprang the three tribes of the Dorian race. This seems to be the

¹ See p. 532. The Aegimius tale says that Doris was the last halt before Peloponnese. The Echemus tale talks of a hundred years' delay at the Isthmus. It is possible to harmonize them: the Heraclids wait about on the frontiers of Peloponnese, until the Dorians join them and bring them back in triumph. But Tyrtæus and Pindar, who follow the Aegimius tale, lend no countenance to this: Tyrtæus brings Heraclids and Dorians alike from Doris, Pindar brings them together all the way from Pindus.

² Pindar brings the men of Aegimius from Pindus. It is probably a late attempt to bring them from Doris which caused the invention of Pindus in Doris, of which Thucydides knows nothing (1, 107, 2).

oldest form of the legend, and north Thessaly, as the place where the Dorian nation was made out of the three tribes, can claim serious consideration.—Whether the three tribes were of as disparate origin as the legend suggests, it is hard to say. There is, however, reason to think that the Hylleis, like the other two tribes, came from the country west of Mount Pindus.

An exact point, between Pindus and the sea, where the Dorians sojourned, is naturally not to be defined: they were not confined to a point. Before their sojourn here, the legends imply they were not separated from the other migrants; it was here, for instance, that they bore the Macedonian name. It is interesting to compare the Lapith king with whom they fought, Coronus, son of Caeneus, with that Caranus, father of Coenus, who sometimes appears in the Macedonian royal genealogy. They did not part in peace, it seems. It was the Macedonians who remained in possession of the field; their migration north past Mount Bermius seems to be later than the Dorian southward move. Among our third class of writers, Diodorus says it was from here that Tectamus, the son of Dorus (and brother of Aegimius?), led a number of Dorians to Crete. Andron independently corroborates this. This early appearance of the Dorians in Crete brings us to our first class of writer, Homer, who, totally ignoring Dorians in the rest of the world, yet mentions them among the peoples of Crete.

Can we accept as a fact that Dorians took ship and came to Crete before any of them arrived in Peloponnese? Their arrival in Peloponnese closed the canon, so to speak, of Homeric geography; were they in Crete before the canon was closed? And if so, was it from 'round Olympus,' as Diodorus says, the extreme northern frontier of the Mycenaean world, that they came? The evidence, in such a question, is naturally of the slenderest. J. L. Myres has pointed out that north of Olympus there is a blank in Homeric geography: the west shore of the Thermaic Gulf belongs neither to Greeks nor Trojans. Here, he suggests, the new invaders were massing: the names of the two coast towns, Dium and Pydna, reappear, as Dia and Hierapytna, in east Crete. This slight evidence is perhaps strengthened by the early appearance of the northern type of sword in precisely this part of Crete; and here also the ancient geographers place Homer's Dorians.

East Crete should not be kept separate from Rhodes¹: the Rhodian entry in the Catalogue of Ships is perhaps the strangest thing in that strange document. Tlepolemus, it says in effect, a son of Heracles, had lately come to Rhodes because he had slain

¹ Note especially the connections between Hierapytna and Camirus.

Licymnius. His people dwelt in the three cities of Lindus, Ialysus and Camirus—'and dwelt in three parts according to their tribes.' This can hardly mean other than that there were three tribes, and one lived in Lindus, one in Ialysus, one in Camirus. Are these the Dorian tribes? Tlepolemus killed his man, all later writers said, in Tiryns; and they were at strange shifts to explain how a Heraclid came to be in Argolis just before the Trojan War. If we have early Dorians here, it is quite certain they did not come from Argolis. But early Dorians they very possibly are; and they come, like their Cretan kinsmen, from the darkness beyond the northern frontier. Tlepolemus was born of an Epirot mother from beyond Pindus; the Heraclids of the neighbouring islands, Cos, etc., afford the only mention that Homer makes of that other great migrant people, the Thessalians¹.

If these early Dorians be real, either in Crete or the other islands, we need not therefore reject the unanimous fifth-century tradition that the Rhodian and Asiatic Dorians came from Peloponnese. The early Dorians are at best very few: Rhodes sends only nine ships to Troy, in Crete they are but one among five elements. They needed reinforcing after the conquest of the mainland, and the Rhodian Eratidae of Pindar, who could doubtless trace their descent from Argive kings, would be part of this reinforcement. Pindar says nothing of it: he cared little for ethnology or to distinguish the heroic world from his own; he looks for no founder after Tlepolemus. The fourth century discovered a hero local in Crete, Rhodes and Ephesus, called Althaemenes, gave him an Argive father, and put him in charge of the expedition, giving as motive a quarrel, or a famine, at home.

Before we leave these early wanderers one further point should be noted. There is, even in Peloponnese, a Heraclid who, like these, is not of the Hyllus strain—Aletes, known to Pindar as founder of Corinth. Aletes means 'the Wanderer': and he and Hippotes, his father, spend most of their lives wandering on the face of the earth. They are not very clearly distinguished: a curious theory was current that 'Hippotes' also meant 'Wanderer'

¹ These early Dorians are very uncertain. As to the separate tribes in Rhodes, note the separate Pamphyloi in Pamphylia and elsewhere in Asia Minor, and perhaps separate Dymanes in Halicarnassus (Steph. Byz. s.v.). This suggests that the tribes were hardly yet welded together. There is no proof that Lindus contained all three tribes. On the other hand, Rhodes city, after the Synoecism, contains tribes such as Camiris and, possibly, Ialysia. May one compare further the tradition bringing the Cnidians from the Dotian Plain with the very early occurrence of iron weapons in that place (the modern village of Marmariani)?

or 'Exile'; and 'Hippotes the Aletes' is credited with the founding of Cnidus, near Rhodes. Thucydides says that the Dorians besieged Corinth from Solygeum: a point which, as the Athenians later proved, is most easily reached from the sea. Is, then, Aletes a part of this early Dorian seafaring?—whether he were already on the Isthmus when the main body arrived, or, after their arrival, came as a reinforcement from the Rhodian Sea. The tradition (in writers after 400 B.C.) puts Aletes in the generation after the conquest; but the archaeological evidence suggests that the sites round Corinth were destroyed at least as early as those in the Argolid.—Perhaps evidence has now accumulated enough to let us suppose that the Dorians coming south from Thessaly took the sea-route as well as, and perhaps before, the land-route.

Before coming to north Thessaly the Dorians, says Herodotus, lived in Phthiotis, in the days of Deucalion, the Greek Noah. Here was the home of the Hellenes in Homer: and here, by Herodotus' time, Greek opinion had brought Deucalion's ark to rest. We have very probably got back to myth; yet the tale is likely enough in itself. These Dorians appear now on Othrys, and later around Olympus. They are still hillsmen like the modern Vlachs. Such peoples do not move across the plains (these are held by men of another culture), they move up and down the spine of Pindus¹. From what direction beyond this barrier they first came, there is no knowing.

We may conjecture that they came from Epirus. Tlepolemus' mother was an Epirot; and 'spectacle brooches,' of the kind worn by Dorians of Sparta, have been found at Dodona. Or they came from Serbia: such brooches have been found also in Serbia, and north-west of Mount Bermius on Lake Ostrovo. But this last, and similar finds farther east, should perhaps be ascribed to the northward move of the Macedonians. Farther west we come into the sphere of the Adriatic culture, which appears in Serbia and Herzegovina, and in south Italy at Coppa Nevigata, and in its turn abuts, both at its north and south ends, on the Italic-speaking *terramara* culture of the Po valley with its early Iron Age offshoot at Timmari, near Taranto. There is no reason to suppose that all these southward-migrant peoples were akin, though all appear to be broad-headed intrusions on the long-headed Mediterranean race. The social institutions which, surviving at Crete and Sparta,

¹ The Lianokladi III people come from Pindus (Wace and Thompson, *Prehist. Thess.* p. 246). They leave no other trace on the plains; but vases with the same peculiar ornament at the base of the handles, probably much later in date, are widely distributed round the lower waters of the Axios.

so distinguished these Dorians from their fellow-Greeks give no clue. They appear to be almost world-wide. In this uncertainty Sir William Ridgeway's hypothesis that the Dorians are from Illyria remains as probable as any. Illyria seems to produce a constant surplus of population, and this fact makes a comparison, between the emigrants and the men who stayed at home, more legitimate than is sometimes allowed. Further, the nature of their 'conquest' dialect seems to imply that they had not come from very far away—unless indeed they learnt their speech during their long hovering on the frontiers.

IV. THE CONQUEST

When they came south at last, the Achaean world crumbled before them. The evidence of dialects shows this; excavation on the mainland, where it has gone deep, confirms it. Thucydides says that the invasion of Thessaly shortly preceded that of Peloponnese. This view had appeared in Herodotus, who tells us that the Pelasgians fled from the mainland to Lemnos; and the Lemnians, displaced in their turn, fled to Peloponnese, and arrived in the generation of the Conquest. That Thessalian and Peloponnesian conquerors were alike Heraclids is affirmed in what are probably the earliest extant lines of Pindar, the opening of the Tenth Pythian.—The fourth-century writers made an even closer connection between the Aetolian invaders and the Dorians. Oxylus, the leader of the former, was turned into a quasi-Heraclid by connection with the family of Deianeira; and, in a tale of ingeniously fulfilled oracles, he guides the Dorians into Peloponnese. The story is late and worthless: Oxylus, in spite, one would have thought, of ample provocation, is never mentioned by Pindar. The Aetolians probably came down the west side of Pindus, from Dodona. Whether they at once swamped the domain of the king of Ithaca—less a king, than warden of the western march—is not known; nor, in spite of much ingenuity, in which island his capital then lay. Their prize was the great plain of Elis: 'Valis' in their own tongue, known later as 'Hollow Valis,' though it was a valley not surrounded by mountains. Their speech was later spread over all the north coast of Peloponnese, to the borders of Sicyon, and southward to the borders of Messenia; in the south they made a sanctuary, perhaps in honour of their Dodonaean Zeus; which later became the great sanctuary of Olympia.

How the true Dorians came south we cannot tell. They may

have come, all of them, by sea. As early as the seventh century, men believed their last halt had been in Doris; and this may well be true. We must not forget, however, that apart from her name the only remarkable thing about Doris was that she lay full on the road between the two seats of the Delphic amphictyony, and consequently possessed two votes in their council. When kinship was claimed, the Dorians of Peloponnese received one of these votes; the mere accident of name would have surely sufficed for an arrangement of such advantage both to the Dorians and Delphi, who between them commanded Greek opinion in the matter.

We have now to deal with the elaborate tale of the Conquest, under the sons of Aristomachus, the three brothers, Temenus, Aristodemus and Cresphontes. The Heraclid Hyllus was defeated at the Isthmus by king Echemus of Arcadia, and his followers covenanted to stay away for three generations. In due course the great-grandsons, Temenus and his brothers, came back. It seems they crossed at Naupactus. (According to Herodotus the Spartans disagreed with the poets, who said that king Aristodemus died before reaching Peloponnese; since later writers assert that king Aristodemus died at Naupactus, perhaps the poets in question said so too.) The three brothers conquered the land in the east and south of Peloponnese, and then divided it by lot, Temenus receiving Argolis; Aristodemus' twin sons (for he himself was dead) Laconia, and Cresphontes Messenia. The dispossessed Achaeans gathered themselves under the grandson of Agamemnon. Marching north, they turned out the Ionians from the north coast, and settling there, called it after themselves Achaea. The Ionians found refuge in Athens, and from Attica went forth and colonized Ionia. All this is clearly familiar to the fifth-century writers: of the three kingdoms, Messenia is called, by Pindar, Pylos; Cresphontes does not occur by name till Euripides; but Sophocles in an early play seems to allude to a picturesque stratagem whereby he 'faked' the lot, and gained Messenia.

The whole story of the Conquest is elaborately worked up, full of proper names and decisive events, and fitted on to the heroic world. It belongs to the Echemus, rather than the Aegimius, cycle; Herodotus lets us understand that there was a poem dealing with it. It is disappointingly useless. The date, in the second generation after the Trojan War, implied in Herodotus' Echemus tale, and expressly stated by Thucydides, we have seen reason to discard; the interval appears to have been far larger. The simultaneous conquest of the three kingdoms is equally difficult. The beginnings of Sparta are later than the destruction of the Argive and

Corinthian towns; it is very doubtful if Messenia became Dorian till conquered by Sparta. The Royal House in Argos was called after Temenus, the leader of the three brothers; but in Sparta, after the sons of Aristodemus' twins¹; in Messenia, after a son of Cresphontes, called Aepytus. Now Homer tells of the tomb of Aepytus on Mt Cyllene in Arcadia, and even in the Messénian legend king Aepytus comes out of Arcadia. It is indeed hard to understand how Messenia ever came to be included among the three Dorian kingdoms. The legend can hardly have held the field before Tyrtæus, for he at least was sure that the Messenians were no Heraclids. Zeus is not so crook-necked, he says, as to let his Heraclid Spartans be beaten by these fellows.

So we shall get little help from the Conquest legends. Heraldic history is the worst enemy of true tradition, and here seems to have been given its head. We are left without any good tradition as to the route by which the Dorians entered Peloponnese. Argolis was the first objective, so that either the Isthmus or the Aegean has rather better claims than Naupactus. But all roads at that time led to Mycenæ and the Inachus valley, whither the strength, renown and riches of Mycenæ must have drawn the main body of the invaders, as their main task and main reward. Smaller bodies settled in the smaller valleys, Sicyon and Phlius in the north, Epidaurus and Troezen on the east coast; south of these, in Hermione and Asine, the Dryopians are said to have been already settled. These Dryopians appear in the legends as moving in the van of the Dorians: to judge by their distribution, they took the sea-route. Asine later shared the fate of the cities in the east of the Inachus valley, but Hermione survived, and kept the memory of her non-Dorian origin.

The Plain of the Inachus, the Argive plain, is the largest in east Peloponnese, and it was marked by long tradition, as well as by a ~~fine~~ road-system, as the political centre of all these cities. In this plain the day of Tiryns and Mycenæ was past, Argos was the city which the Dorians made great. The pre-eminence of this city of Argos is a new thing, Homer almost completely ignores it; but by the fifth century B.C. it has been mirrored back both into the tale of Troy and the other heroic legends. This early greatness of Argos—which in classical times hung like a mill-stone round her neck—is still evident in an early (perhaps seventh century) oracle, in which Sparta is praised for her women, but Argos for her warriors. A certain religious suzerainty over all

¹ A genealogy which goes above the eponym is suspicious, though not necessarily false, as H. M. Chadwick (*The Heroic Age*) has pointed out.

these cities of east Peloponnese was still exercised in the fifth century; at the time of the Conquest, a religious and a political suzerainty were probably not to be distinguished. It centres in the worship of Apollo Pythaeus, in which all the Dorian cities of Argolis, and Hermione as well, were grouped under the presidency of Argos. Telesilla, the Argive poetess, proudly affirms that it was to Argos that the god first came. These cities have all foundation legends, showing as their founder some member of the family of Temenus, the first Dorian king of Argolis; and they formed that Heritage of Temenus whose fragments were re-assembled by Pheidon, Argos' last great king.

Among these cities Corinth is an exception. The famous Corinthian Apollo may or may not be Pythaeus; certainly Corinth knew no Temenid founder, but a Heraclid of her own, Aletes, who came by sea, and likely enough, as we have seen, was already on the Isthmus when the other Dorians reached Peloponnese. The soundest element in the tradition, the early settlement on Solygeum, implies at least that the Corinthians arrived by sea separately, and that Corinth was no daughter of Argos. There is no reason to think that early Dorian Corinth was particularly important: the list of kings from Aletes to Telestes is probably worthless.

Herodotus says the Dorian conquerors invaded Attica, which had received the refugees from Peloponnese; he suggests, somewhat doubtfully, it was in the second generation. Attica, as the world knew, saved herself¹; but Megara was at that time made Dorian. Megara is remarkable for one thing, in her, alone, (?)² of Dorian states, there is no trace of any distinction between Dorians and pre-Dorians. Perhaps this was due to generous treatment: perhaps there were no pre-Dorians. It is conceivable that this attack on Attica, and conquest of Megara, should be placed on the march south, and the united Dorian host swept the Isthmus clean. There is no conqueror's name for Megara, the great leaders passed on south, making for Mycenae. The late stories which make Megara a specifically Corinthian colony do not deserve notice.

'By God's Grace,' said Pindar, speaking of Aegina, 'the Dorian host of Hyllus and Aegimius came here and made our city.' He

¹ She kept her own language, at least. Some will see in Herodt. ix, 73 a bowdlerized version of a successful Dorian invasion of Attica. Doubtless the frontier demes, Decelaea, Aphidna, etc., had not been quite waterproof; but anyone who wishes to ascribe the Dipylon culture to such intrusion, must explain the Attic dialect.

² 'Alone' perhaps strains the casual evidence. It seems true at least of the mainland and the two great islands.

half implies that Dorian Aegina dates from the great conquest. But the world knew, though Aegina might wish to forget, that she was a colony of Epidaurus. The famous Treasure of Aegina in the British Museum shows a very late survival of Mycenaean culture in the island. Epidaurus had too small a plain of her own; she early expanded, not only to Aegina, but to the Cynurian coast, south of Argos. Her colonies came under the Argive suzerainty; in the early days, says Herodotus, the dominions of Argos reached down past Cape Malea to Cythera. But we must now note another and greater southward expansion, which was one day to tear away from Argos these southern possessions—we must follow the Dorians from Argolis into Laconia.

It is probable the founders of Sparta passed round the north shoulder of Parnon into the Eurotas valley—unless indeed they went by sea. Coming down past Sellasia, they would debouch on the plain at the point where they built their city. Apollo Pythaeus was worshipped by Spartans, as by other Dorians; but their city was beyond the range of Argive suzerainty. Their rich and enclosed plain—like a garden with high walls—was a seat of ancient culture; what little splendour was left perished at the Dorian touch, but at all times he who rules the Spartan plain is one of the powers of Peloponnese. How soon the Spartans realized their heritage, we cannot know; the excavators put the beginnings of Sparta in the tenth century; in the eighth, they are an expanding and conquering people, under their king Theopompus, the first certainly historic figure in Greek history.

The pre-Dorian people of Peloponnese are commonly called Achaeans, that is, the men of Homer's heroic world. The historical Achaeans, in south Thessaly and north Peloponnese, who spoke a 'conquest' dialect, can hardly be regarded as their clearest survivals; the one certainly pre-Conquest element in Peloponnese is the *Arcadians*. Fifth-century tradition spoke of *Aeolians* in Corinth and *Ionians* in Cynuria; and the Ionians of Asia Minor claimed to come, sometimes from the north coast of Peloponnese, and sometimes from Pylos on the west coast. The dialects of the Aeolians and Arcadians are to a certain extent akin; the epic dialect of Homer has traces of Ionic, Aeolic and Arcadian, as it were the *lingua franca* of the pre-Dorians. About the time of the Dorian invasion there was a great exodus eastwards of all these three peoples; it had possibly begun before the Dorian conquest, it was certainly intensified by it.

Of those who stayed in Peloponnese, Arcadia formed the

nucleus: this country, the rocky heart of the peninsula, was never, in spite of prolonged efforts, penetrated by the Dorians. Down to the fourth century B.C. Arcadia formed the natural *point d'appui* for the non-Dorian elements in the surrounding Dorian countries. An Arcadian-speaking people is found in Cyprus—the men who undertook this long sea-journey had surely more experience of the sea than the later Arcadians could have; it is likely that the Arcadians occupied in Peloponnese, before the conquest, the same sort of position as did their kinsmen in speech, the Aeolians, in Greece north of the Isthmus. Thus, even after the conquest, Messenia remains under an Arcadian dynasty, the Aepytidae.—It is not clear how real a distinction can be made between Arcadians and Aeolians: in all our sources, from Homer downwards, we find the sons of Aeolus in northern Peloponnese. This may be due to a southward thrust of the Aeolian-speaking people: a very late notice of a fight between Boeotians and Arcadians concerning their frontiers may echo some tradition of this. The thrust would, of course, be intensified by the beginnings of the Dorian invasion.—East of the Aegean, the Aeolians in Lesbos and Arcadians in Cyprus were separated by an Ionian-speaking mass, whose *provenance* is difficult to determine. During the Dark Age, these Ionians cover a more compact area than the other language groups—conceivably the dialect we know took form during that time; otherwise, we must probably imagine them as a coast-dwelling people, on the Saronic Gulf and in Cynuria, and possibly in Pylos also and on the Corinthian Gulf. A Pylian element is strongly attested in Ionia; but there is no need to suppose this Pylian element was Ionic in speech before it reached Asia.—Pre-Greek elements in Peloponnese, such as may be the Lydian Pelops, or the Cretans, can be provisionally regarded as already absorbed in one or other of the Greek-speaking peoples.

In many of the Dorian cities of Argolis we hear of a fourth tribe, in which the pre-Dorians were enrolled and received full citizenship; it is to be assumed in them all, except perhaps Corinth. In Sicyon they were called Aigialeis, the coast-men. This was also said to be the Ionians' name while they lived near here; it reappears in Homer's account of this part of Agamemnon's kingdom. It can only have been a favoured few in each valley who were thus enrolled; the majority, especially of the peasants, were probably everywhere made serfs, and worked the land for the new owners. The gradual liberation of these serfs forms much of the political history of the Argolid. The intermediate status, of *perioikoi*, occurs in the Argive plain, and probably elsewhere;

these men were free, but had no political rights. The Argive perioikoi fall into two groups, the Eastern and Western. The Western group, Herodotus says, were 'turned into Dorians by the combined action of Argos and Time'; the Eastern group, containing such ancient and famous cities as Mycenae, Tiryns and Nauplia, were more stubborn, and gradually, as she was strong enough, Argos destroyed them.

But those who could, escaped overseas. Since the fall of Cnossus, about 1400 B.C., the Argive plain was the centre of the Mycenaean world; from here the Arcadian-speaking pre-Dorians had probably long begun to overrun the eastern islands. In Achaia as the name of the citadel of Ialysus, in the Akaiwasha on the Delta, and (it has even been conjectured) in the Hiv(v)ites of Palestine, may be traces of this eastward thrust. We have seen that possibly before the conquest Dorians appear in these seas (p. 523 *sq.*). The conquest will have caused a further stream of Arcadians, who perhaps avoided these early Dorians and passed on to Cyprus; finally, fresh reinforcements of Dorians followed from Peloponnese. It is of course impossible to sort out chronologically these waves of Arcadian and Dorian colonization: the Dorians had the last word; it is only at the extreme fringes, in Cyprus, Pamphylia and possibly Cyrene, that the Arcadians were later to be traced.

Crete, after her centuries of splendid and creative energy, now touches the lowest depths of exhaustion. The very heart of the dead past, she contributes later to the Greek Renaissance one holy man, Epimenides, and two sculptors. But she took little part in it herself, and throughout Greek history lay moored out of the main currents of peace and war.—The Rhodian entry in the Catalogue is less remarkable, all told, for its historical *crucis* than for its beauty; it has a large share in making the Catalogue the surprisingly great poem which it is. The favoured island of which it tells us was, eventually at least, possessed by Dorians; perhaps no Greek state had so long and steady a share of the Hellenic sunlight.—The Dorians in Crete and the islands were regarded as colonists from Argolis, and a few from Laconia; a fifth-century inscription shows Argos at least taking seriously her duties as metropolis. Of Thera and Melos, which the fifth century regarded as Spartan colonies, all that we can say with safety is that they were made Dorian at the time of the conquest. The very early date, twelfth century, to which Thucydides ascribes the settlement of Melos, is probably from the local tradition, and was doubtless computed by the counting of generations. The Greeks commonly put too many years to a

generation; and a date, equally too high, would be inferred by them from other known genealogies which seem to reach back to the heroic age: those, for instance, of Hecataeus, or king Pyrrhus, or the Spartan kings.

The Dorians did not reach so wide in their seaward expansion as the Arcadians had done. Partly, no doubt, their thirst for land was slaked; but it is noteworthy that tradition puts the founding of Utica, the beginning of the Phoenician colonization in north Africa, in the eleventh century. Among the non-Dorian elements at Corinth are some which may be Phoenician: the hero Melicertes is perhaps to be compared with Melkarth. More striking is the Corinthian Aphrodite, whose temple-customs, astounding in a Greek city, are revealed in a shamefaced fragment of Pindar. Perhaps the 'Wanderer' brought them from his eastern journeys; but Corinth was always open to wanderers; and if there are Phoenician elements there, their origin cannot be dated. As to the Corinthian tribes, we have only a very late report (in Suidas) that Aletes instituted eight: so dim a tradition is hardly worth speculation; it does not warrant K. O. Müller's inference that the Dorians in Corinth formed only three-eighths of the citizen body¹.

V. SPARTA

In Laconia, the relations between Dorians and pre-Dorians are much as in Argolis—with important modifications. The Spartans became masters in their own house; it is significant in the later history how much more absolutely Laconia is controlled by Sparta than the Argolid by Argos. In Sparta, like Megara and the islands, there is no fourth tribe; although, unlike these others, Sparta has the free Arcadians on her borders. As late as the Second Messenian War the Spartan army is brigaded according to the three tribes. Again, with all her perioikoi, Sparta was as happy as Argos with her western group: with the aid of Time, she turned them all into Lacedaemonians.

Dorian Sparta (the 'Sown Land'?) lies in the plain; excavation has proved this city to be, more radically than in the case of Argos, a Dorian creation. On the high bluffs east of the river, at the spot the Spartans called Serapna (Therapne), traces have been

¹ The Oktas of Nicolaus Damasc., fr. 60, may be like the strategic board at Athens, one from each tribe: but this is post-tyrant. It is to be supposed there were once Dorian tribes in Corinth; but the Hylleis in Corcyra prove nothing. They may be from Corinth; but in Corcyra we are near the Dorian home, and Hylleis and a city Hylle are reported on the mainland opposite.

found of a Mycenaean city. It was apparently¹ destroyed by the Dorians, and on the desolate site a sanctuary was maintained in honour of Menelaus and Helen, and her brothers, the Dioscuri. This was surely the Lacedaemon of the *Odyssey*; it commands the Spartan plain, looking southward over Vaphio, where the kings of Therapne were buried in splendour, and Amyclae, their holy place.

In fifth-century tradition the capture of Amyclae marks the beginning of Sparta's greatness. The displacement of the great epic names which followed the Dorian conquest of Peloponnese must not detain us, except to note how much Amyclae gained by it: she becomes the site, in Pindar, of the murder of Agamemnon and Cassandra, and perhaps the home of Orestes, though already in Pindar it may be merely a poetic name for ancient Sparta. After Therapne fell, Amyclae perhaps became a city of refuge for dispossessed Achaeans.—The story of the long struggle with her cannot well be part of the common Conquest legend; Laconia, with Amyclae still unsubdued, would have been too poor a third share even for Aristodemus' twins. The fifth-century story, which should be kept clear of the painful intricacies of later writers, ascribed the final capture to the help of the Aigeidai. Pindar, with the herald's flair, claimed a Theban origin for this family, and even personal kinship; but, as so often, left it to the fourth century to explain how this had happened. We need not concern ourselves with this connection. The help was commemorated every year in Amyclae, at the Feast of the *Hyacinthia*. It is a rash thing to combine variant legends; but perhaps the Minyans, whom Herodotus combines with the Aigeidai, in a rather disingenuous story, may be the real helpers. Herodotus indeed says nothing of the capture of Amyclae, but he does relate how the Minyans were distributed among the tribes. If this be right, we catch a glimpse of how the Spartans mastered Laconia. They enlist one element of the native population against another, the Minyans against the Amycleans; enrolling the former, not into a fourth tribe, but among their own three tribes. The Minyans lived on Taygetus, in a way familiar among subject populations in Greece at all times, a pre-Achaean remnant, perhaps from Crete; another trace of them occurs in Triphylia. There is independent tradition that Sparta was generous with her citizenship in the time of the conquest, for the Dorians, it is

¹ It is a badly weathered site, and the excavators are diffident. A fragment of Alcman speaks of 'the fine towers of Serapna'; we do not know the context, perhaps it came in a heroic myth.

said, were but few in number. This distribution among the three tribes was a wiser device than the Argolic fourth tribe, which in Sicyon seems to have kept the racial antipathy alive. Later, a strange arrest of organic growth overtook Sparta, and she threw away this early wisdom.

For the Perioikoi, Ephorus gives a plain account of their origin, but it is not evidence. Before he wrote, the air was thick with pamphlets, which proved their points by quite imaginary pictures of the beginnings of the Spartan state. In the fifth century Thucydides calls the Perioikoi of Cythera, Dorians and colonists of Lacedaemon. A late tale, which is yet free from the 'theoretic' air of Ephorus, says the two perioecic cities in south-west Messenia, Asine and Methone, were plantations of Argive refugees from Asine and Nauplia, when these were destroyed by Argos. The process continues in the fifth century in Thyrea and round Scillus. Plantations of men seem to be Sparta's method for securing her perioecic towns¹: her own men at first, and then her friends. These men, detached from the central body, lost their say in the government of the country: how much did ingenious legislation save the Athenian cleruchs or Roman colonists from the same fate? They went out in quest of land, or trade, or to guard the frontiers, and finally were strung in a wide circle round the central city. For Sparta allowed no other town near her: Amyclae, with a part at least of her inhabitants, was incorporated in the city of Sparta; but the rest of the inhabitants of the river valley became serfs. They were called Helots, perhaps after the town Helos, which lay by the mouth of the river.

Beyond Taygetus lay a rich land which the Dorians had not yet touched. It was later called Messene (Messenia); its river, the Pamisos, watered two fine valleys, the upper one Stenyclarus, and the lower Macaria. The upper valley was later peopled by the dangerous majority of the Spartan Helots, the lower, which formed the top of the Messenian Gulf, was planted with perioecic towns. On the west coast of Peloponnese lay the famous Homeric kingdom of Pylos, and part at least of it lay within the later Messene. It was doubtless a great kingdom before the conquest; princely burials have been found at two sites on this coast, both of which, in classical times, bore the name Pylos. But it can hardly be questioned that Pylos and its king Nestor owe part of

¹ The racial blend in Sparta and her Perioikoi was probably fairly uniform. Thucydides at least is aware of no racial distinction. The hypothesis which is assumed rather than proved in Meister's *Dorer und Achäer* (viz. that there is a racial distinction) seems to be groundless.

their great name in Homer to the refuge they afforded the Achaeans, when the Dorians came into Argolis and Laconia. Attica and the Ionian cities, which, after the Dorians had swept the mainland, became the home of the Epic, were full of great families which claimed to be sprung from the Pylian refugees. Mimnermus tells us it was from Pylos that the founders of his own city, Colophon, had come. It is perhaps natural that the 'close of the Canon' of Homeric geography should be rather later in this last corner of Peloponnese. 'We were few and hard pressed in Pylos: for the mighty Heracles had come and pressed us hard in the years before, and slain all the best of us,' says Nestor, in a long tale full of west Peloponnesian local colour. The last Pylians, before they crossed to Asia Minor, were indeed between the hammer and the anvil of Elis and Sparta.

It is possible that this advance of the Dorians, and consequent shrinkage of the kingdom of Pylos, is mirrored in certain passages of Homer¹. The line of advance which these passages indicate is, one may say, imposed by the geographical conditions: the invaders first secure the Taenarum promontory and the left flank of the Langáda Pass, and then overflow into the Macaria plain. Such an advance along the north of the Messenian Gulf is almost a pre-requisite to that plantation of Argive refugees on the far shore, at Asine and Methone, which tradition places in the eighth century. The complete process is the last act in the Dorian migration, and the prelude to king Theopompus' great war of conquest. The men who pass round Taygetus into Macaria are still in quest of new homes, and when they reach them they settle down; but the victorious soldiers of Theopompus, after they have conquered Stenyclarus, return to their Spartan homes.

¹ Pylos shows a shifting frontier in the Epic towards both Elis and Sparta. Towards Elis, the Alpheus at one time flows through the land of the Pylians (*Il.* v, 545), at another forms the Pylian frontier (*Il.* xi, 712). Towards Sparta, as is natural, the shrinkage is more pronounced. We see Sparta, first reaching over the extreme south of Taygetus to Messe (*Il.* ii, 582, the locality of Messe was hidden from the wise and prudent Strabo, but revealed to the babe-like Pausanias), then contemplating the conquest of the seven cities on the sea which more or less exactly correspond to the plain of Macaria (*Il.* ix, 149, cf. a similar contemplated conquest *Od.* iv, 176), and, finally, in the only passage of Homer where Messene is named, this conquest is consummated; Messene is part of Lacedaemon (*Od.* xxi, 13. 15). If Messe be Sparta's first foothold in these parts, we can understand the new name, Messene, which was given to the Spartan dominions beyond Taygetus.

CHAPTER XX

HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

I. THE MAIN TRADITIONS

THE fact of Levantine history, which challenges most attention during the last quarter of the second millennium, is the settlement effected on the Anatolian islands and mainland coast by racial elements of the group to which the historic Hellenes belonged. While the fact of such settlement is certain, remarkably little is known about either the circumstances of the original colonization, or the early history of the colonists after establishment in their new homes. The historians, who, before the fifth century B.C., wrote about Greek Asia Minor, survive only in a few quotations; and valuable as is the history of Herodotus for the past of his own part of the world, still more valuable would have been the lost *Ionica* of his kinsman, Panyassis. Therefore, to an exceptional degree, we have to depend upon traditions preserved by Greeks of later times, and to make such synthesis as we can of their inconsistencies, contradictions and aetiological fabrications.

Archaeology gives as yet less help than it may be in a position to offer in the future. Very little scientific excavation has been carried out among primitive remains in western Asia Minor. The sites and immediate neighbourhoods of only two of the earlier Hellenic colonies have been searched deeply in any part; and, so far as their exploration has been reported, the oldest strata were examined over but a small area in each instance. These sites are those of Miletus and Ephesus. At the first-named place pre-Hellenic remains were tapped at one point within the city and at another outside its walls. At the second, the excavator dug down to the bottom of human remains in a small central space of the Artemisium site outside the town walls; but he found its lowest stratum by no means so old as might be expected to occur under the original city. Besides these remains, one pre-Hellenic tomb, denuded of more than half its contents in antiquity, at Assarlik in Caria, has been cleared by a scientific archaeologist. Other tombs in the same neighbourhood, which had been robbed completely, have been examined for their structural types and the fragments of pottery and other objects left in or near them.

It only remains to be said that a site of great antiquity has been explored deeply in the extreme north of the west coast—at Hissarlik in the Troad; but since no Hellenic colony seems to have been planted there till a late period, its evidence bears more on conditions preceding, or surrounding, the first advent of Greeks, than on the history of their actual settlement and early development. In the regions lying at the back of the Greek colonial belt, certain surface surveys and excavations have thrown light on the conditions under which the Greek settlements came into being and grew in early stages. Particular mention should be made of the excavations carried out on the sites of Sardes in Lydia, and Gordium in Phrygia. Explorations also in and about the 'Midas City' in Phrygia have provided a body of evidence of great value in this connection; and, as will be stated later, several instructive discoveries have been made elsewhere in the western interior of the peninsula.

It was a general belief of later Greeks that the primary settlement of the Anatolian islands and mainland coast by western colonists was very far from having been the work of a single mass migration. The foundation legends of the Asian colonies indicate a process protracted through many generations. The first stage seems to have been a long one of sporadic settlement and gradual infiltration by independent groups of settlers who left their western lands for very various reasons, without authoritative mandate or other community of purpose. This stage was regarded by tradition as having begun before the Trojan War, and closed some two or three generations after it. The second stage, according to the tradition, was one of more concentrated colonization, instituted after the return of the Achaeans from Troy, lasting a comparatively short time, and completed by, say, the close of the eleventh century B.C. It usually is known to historians as the Ionian Migration, and was believed by the Greeks themselves to have been caused by the overcrowding of Attica with returned warriors and refugees from Troy. They credited this movement with a common impulse, and ascribed its guidance to sons of king Codrus.

At the same time it must be borne in mind that neither Greek tradition nor Greek history warrants the assumption that these groups of migrants were sent forth by Athens to be extensions of herself. They were simply men turned loose to find homes elsewhere. None of the resultant settlements in Asia seems to have retained an intimate tie with Athens as its mother-city; all developed apart from her, and on different lines. Miletus, for

example, though she kept the four Attic tribes, named half her months differently and paid no special honour to the Athenian goddess. Apollo became her tutelary deity. Samos adopted a non-Ionian goddess, Hera, as chief patroness; and, more even than Miletus, diverged from Athens in the nomenclature of her calendar and her tribes. The greater Greek settlements of Asia, in short, must not be thought of as colonies of western cities in anything like the same sense as the secondary Greek settlements in Asia Minor. These last were true colonies of the first settlements there: so, for example, Iasos was a colony of Miletus, and Nagidos, in Cilicia, of Samos. But, while these secondary settlements were founded for the benefit of the metropolis, no such idea seems to have actuated the earliest colonization of Asia Minor by Greeks, or to have survived in the subsequent relations of the colonies to the mother-cities. This is as true of the Dorian and Aeolian colonies, as of the Ionian.

The earlier traditional period includes two social phases. The first is one of foundation or seizure of settlements by sons of gods, by heroes, by Amazons, and by various peoples whom we regard as pre-Hellenic, such as Telchines or other Cretans, Leleges, Carians, Minyans and Pelasgians, the last being stated to have come from European mainland districts, ranging from Laconia to Thessaly. The second phase—how far overlapping the first, we do not know—is proto-Hellenic, the colonization being then the work of Dorian or 'Aeolic' Greeks. The Dorians are derived, in the legends, chiefly from Argos and cities of the Argolid: the Aeolic settlers, from Thessaly, Phocis, and other parts of northern and central Greece, including the Megarid; but whether from the last before or after its conquest by Dorians is not clear. The Dorian settlers make for the southern Sporades and the south-western coast of the Anatolian mainland—the region known in classical times as Caria—and for other regions lying as far round the south coast of the peninsula as Cilicia. The northern Greeks make for the north-western shores from Magnesia and Cyme round to the Propontis, into which the voyage of the 'Argo' from Thessalian Iolcus had shown a way. Each of these great groups, it will be observed, colonized its opposite coast; and between the two areas so settled there remained a considerable interval uncolonized by either and reserved for the subsequent Ionian Migration. This tract is the long and deeply indented littoral which extends from south of Mount Mycale to north of the Hermus estuary, together with the great islands of Samos and Chios. It may be said at once that the legendary ascription of the

two original groups of settlements to southern and northern Greeks respectively is argued to be fact by such evidence as the classical speech and communal organization of the Greek colonies in north-western and south-western Anatolia afford. The dialects spoken by the Greeks from Miletus right round to Mallus in Cilicia, and also in Cyprus, are nearest kin to Peloponnesian dialects of later times; and tribe-names appear in Carian and Pamphylian colonies which are known elsewhere only in the Peloponnesus. For the Aeolic north we have no such good evidence from tribe-names; but its prevailing dialect was related nearly to that of classical Thessaly.

A third social phase coincides with the second stage of settlement—the Ionian Migration. This movement again follows its own parallel first, apparently, to the islands from Lesbos to Chios and Samos, and finally to that mainland tract which had been left free by the two earlier groups of migrants. To substantiate the claim of the Ionian cities to belong to the same social group as the Athenians positive evidence is offered by their dialect and social organization in later times. For example, Miletus had all the four Attic tribes, to which it added two non-Attic. We may conclude, however, from the failure of two of the greatest Ionian cities, Ephesus and Colophon, to celebrate the *Apatūria* (the Athenian festival of the *Phratry*) that there was mixture in the Ionian Migration, as, indeed, Greek tradition always held there was. We hear both that the Greek settlers themselves were heterogeneous and also that they amalgamated with the indigenous population. Among original non-Ionian elements Thessalians and Boeotians can be discerned, both being in considerable strength, and possibly earlier established in Ionia than the elements from Attica. They seem to be represented by the two non-Attic tribes of Miletus.

For lack of archaeological material, this tradition of the stages and social phases of the original Greek colonization of Asia Minor cannot further be controlled. Some allowance, doubtless, must be made for popular antedating of later ideas and conditions. Thus, the ethnic distinction of 'Dorians' from 'Ionians,' as well as the ethnical character in later times of certain colonies, whose respective mother-cities had become subsequently seats of either Dorians or Ionians (Megara is an example of change after the colonizing age), may have been presumed by the tradition at too early dates. Later, at all events, we know that the Ionian name, in the form *Yāwān*, represented to the Semitic peoples of Asia all Greeks without distinction. This use may have come about (as usually is assumed) through the greater familiarity of the East

then and previously with seafaring men from the Ionian cities, especially Miletus, than with those from less opulent and less venturesome non-Ionian communities.

While the balance of probability is in favour of such an explanation of a use which had evidently become habitual with Assyrians and Hebrews by the times of Sargon and Ezekiel (xxvii, 13), the possibility must not be lost sight of altogether that the use may have been so much older than those times that it implies the existence of an 'Ionian' people somewhere in Asia Minor before the historical Ionian Migration. If the Hebrew race-genealogy, contained in Genesis x, which includes Javan (Yāwān), as 'father' of (probably) Citium (Cyprus), Tarsus (Cilicia), Elishah (the Aleian Plain?) and Rhodes, were to be accepted for a faithful embodiment of very ancient Semitic geography and ethnology, that possibility would become almost a certainty; but, in fact, it is far from proved that the genealogy in question is much older, as we have it, than the age in which it was apparently written down, that is, perhaps the later period of the Hebrew monarchy (see vol. 1, p. 184 *sq.*). Two names which also appear in it, Meshech and Tubal, certainly represent peoples who were unimportant, if existent at all, in Asia Minor till near the end of the second millennium B.C.; and if its warrant for Yāwān goes no farther back than this date, it does not necessarily imply pre-Migration Ionians.

At the same time there are reasons for pushing the first appearances of Greek settlers in the easternmost Levant back to very early days, earlier, perhaps, than their settlement on any point of the west coast of Asia Minor. As has been remarked often, the origin of the 'Arcadian' colonies in Cyprus seems lost in an antiquity more remote than that of any other Greek settlements in Asia. The peculiar syllabic script used by the Cypriotes of historic times is so ill-adapted to the expression of the Greek language that its choice for that purpose cannot reasonably be explained except by presuming its use firmly established in the island before the convenient Graeco-Phoenician alphabetic characters were invented (vol. 1, p. 144). That is to say, we must assume a firmly-established Greek population in Cyprus well before, at latest, the tenth century B.C. Also the use, in the earliest Cypriote inscriptions known, of a Greek name—the word for 'queen'—to designate the tutelary goddess of the island, points to early local prevalence of the Greek race and of Greek speech.

Moreover, on the opposite Cilician coast, Mallus (which perhaps is the Mannus mentioned in Egyptian texts of the XVIIIth

Dynasty, in conjunction with Asy and Alashiya, as a centre even then of power and importance) had, as a Greek colony, an accepted foundation legend which differentiates it from other Greek settlements in Asia Minor and may imply general belief in its superior antiquity. The joint founders of Mallus, according to the legend, were actual members of the force that besieged Troy. After its fall they do not go to Greece, but travel south to the shrine of the Clarian Apollo in pre-Ionian Ionia, and thence wander eastwards to found cities in the bay of the Levant. One of the pair, whose name appears in an old designation of Pamphylia, and at two Cilician spots, Mopsuestia on the Pyramus, and Mopsucrene on the road northwards from Tarsus, may be the same Mopsus (or Moxus) who, according to a Greek legend about early Lydia, pushed into Syria and, reaching Askalon, threw its tutelary goddess into her own sacred lake—a story which sounds curiously like an echo of the historic invasion of Palestine early in the twelfth century B.C. by peoples of Asia Minor. Cilician Tarsus also was credited with early Greek colonists. In the seventh century, as we know from a record of Sennacherib, a Javanian people was resident in Cilicia, apparently not on the coast only. How long had it been there? and how did Cilicia come to be before the end of the second millennium (as from certain classes of objects found in north Syria and Cyprus as well as in Cilicia itself, it may reasonably be claimed to have been, even if it were not, the seat of the Keftians) a centre of art strongly influenced by Aegean forms and decoration? The answer must be sought in the unexplored soil of the region itself.

The Greeks habitually looked to the Trojan War as an era by which to date the foundation of their colonies in Asia Minor. For this habit they had cause; since, probably, that war was itself an early episode in the story of their settlement. Desirous to effect a footing on the calm shores of the Hellespont and the Propontis, a Greek confederacy under Achaean leadership found itself confronted by an Anatolian confederacy, which drew allies from coast-lands as remote as Lycia, and had Phrygian support at its back. If the period now generally proposed for that struggle, the middle of the twelfth century, be approximately correct, it coincides significantly with the later phases of those large movements of peoples into and out of Asia Minor, which destroyed the Hattic kingdom in Cappadocia, and were brought to a stand at last, perhaps on the frontier of Egypt, by the resistance of Ramses III¹. In the general catastrophe of elder powers of Asia

¹ See pp. 174 sq., 283 sq., 321.

Minor under pressure from the north, whether from the Caucasian or the Thracian country or from both, men of the west seized an opportunity.

II. THE RESISTANCE OF IONIA AND ITS CAUSE

If an approximate date—about 1150 B.C.—may be accepted for the beginning of Greek settlement on the western Anatolian shore, there is no good reason for rejecting the chronology which the Greeks accepted for the subsequent process. They believed the central section of the littoral to have been the last upon which their colonists had landed to stay. Obviously their belief needs explanation, seeing that this central section is at once the most fertile and clement, the best provided with sheltered harbours, and the most favoured by natural routes of communication with the interior. Admirably adapted by nature to the development of Hellenic society, as history would prove, why did not Ionia attract Greek settlers before the comparatively arduous, lean and isolated south-west, and the comparatively cold and harbourless north-west? The explanation may lie, not in accident—for one cannot suppose so near and accessible a coast as the Ionian to have been less known to Aegean peoples than the rest of western Anatolia—but in the existence of a hostile society there sufficiently organized and compact to keep rovers of the seas away.

Such an assumption finds support from two facts. First, that in the heart of this section—in the Smyrna-Magnesia district—are to be seen the most notable pre-Hellenic remains yet observed in western Anatolia, namely, the Hittite rock-sculptures and the sanctuaries at different points of the Sipylus range—the so-called Tantalid tombs and the fortifications at the head of the Gulf of Smyrna. Second, that in or near this section lay the four (or, perhaps six) cities whose foundation was ascribed by Greeks to Amazons. In view of all the facts, there can be little doubt that an organized Asiatic state which derived ultimate inspiration from the Hattic empire at its greatest period, *i.e.* the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C., was established on the Aegean coast at the point at which debouch the two great arteries leading from the central plateau by way of the valleys of the Hermus and the Maeander. This coastal kingdom, which was centred at 'Aeolic' Smyrna, probably supported itself in independence first of the Cappadocian king and subsequently of the Phrygian, who can hardly have maintained at so great a distance provincial administrations.

In any case, it seems that in the central section of the west coast,

during the latter part of the second millennium, the strength of inland societies of Asia Minor was felt sufficiently to retard Greek settlement for some generations after it had been effected to south and north. Those natural inland ways, which would make the later fortunes of the Ionian cities, not only served for a long time to keep Hellenes out of the best heritage in western Asia Minor (as, to judge by the paucity of Aegean remains of the full Minoan periods, they had long kept Cretans), but they were to continue to spell danger to Hellenism after it had made good its footing. Smyrna, Ephesus and Miletus remained throughout classical times the Greek cities most generally contaminated with Orientalism: and, probably, Colophon, not a pure Ionian city, should be added to the trio. Smyrna was vexed continually by migrations and attacks from inland, was destroyed by the Lydians, and remained unable to establish itself firmly as a Greek city till quite late days. Ephesus, whose cult retained a strong Asiatic flavour to the last, lay equally at the mercy of attacks from inland, whether Cimmerian or Lydian. Miletus, threatened with even greater frequency, but well defended, either by marshes or by a stout Carian element in its population, appears in the history of Greek art as the chief propagator of oriental motives, and in the history of Hellenic politics as often detaching itself from the comity of Hellenism despite the boasted purity of its Ionian blood.

Once the Greek elements had established themselves on the Anatolian coast, their societies developed what the world has since deemed typical Hellenism more rapidly than the communities which claimed to be their mothers. All seem to have begun independent life (after intervals of various duration according to the strength of the native community into which each group of settlers intruded) with some form of monarchy: the kings, in the Ionian colonies, being either Codridae of Athenian extraction, or Glaucidiae of Lycian origin. The latter perhaps obtained power where the Ionian element was weakest. In Cyme kingship lasted on to the close of the eighth century B.C. at least; but elsewhere it had vanished before that date. Under the monarchs the Hellenic elements as a whole constituted aristocracies distinguished from more numerous native non-Greek populations; and their distinction, as can be divined in the history of Miletus, in the sixth century, long survived the fall of the monarchies, unobliterated by any complete Hellenization of the native elements.

The Greek aristocracies, however, as by natural increase and by fresh accessions of western Hellenes they tended quickly to become majorities of the town-dwellers, developed within them-

selves new distinctions, small groups gaining and holding power and privilege, against the rest; and the first historical light which falls on Ionian cities reveals the Hellenic class in each already divided into land-owning oligarchs, and potential democracies, unprivileged and unquiet, which, though far as yet from realizing the ideal of the rule of all by all in turn, had often achieved the first step towards that end by substituting a single elective chief for the rule of a self-appointed few. Thus Miletus, which was administered by an elective President of the Council in the seventh century, had even earlier been under an elective dictator; while Ephesus, if Greek tradition is to be believed, seems to have arrived at something like republican equality among its Hellenic aristocrats within two or three generations of its first settlement by Ionians. At Colophon, also, there is evidence for very early struggles within the Hellenic class between a majority and a land-owning minority, the ultimate victory resting with the last, after the more intractable elements had been expelled to seek refuge at Smyrna and at Ephesus. The 'Tyrannis,' which does not appear in Asia till near the close of the seventh century, was, in its origin, a product of increasing democracy; and the set-back which, by its development, it administered to that movement was more apparent than real, an eddy in a stream rather than a reversal of its general direction. Nor was it only in political evolution that these cities took a start of their European mother. Other fruits of free, leisured and luxurious life reached maturity earlier in them. The intellectual and artistic output of the Asiatic Hellenes in the eighth and seventh centuries has so little contemporary counterpart in European Greece, that typical European Humanism may justly be said to have originally been developed in cities of Asia¹.

To account for this phenomenon of rapid development—a graft which overtopped its parent tree within so short time—the continental position of the Asian cities as compared with the peninsular or insular positions of the European Greek states may be pleaded. The former societies had behind them a larger area from which to draw wealth and civilization. It is only necessary to pass at the present day from Piraeus to Smyrna to be conscious of entering a world of greater possibilities. To appreciate the validity of this cause it will be necessary to study, in a later volume, what is known of the societies which lay at the back of the Greek colonies during the periods of both their first establishment and subsequent early development. Other causes no doubt

¹ With the following paragraph, cf. the independent argument, p. 400 *sq.*

contributed: for instance, the natural fertility of western Anatolia, which is greater in both degree and extent than that of western Greece, and its less rigorous climate and easier access to eastern seats of civilization. But the sum of these causes taken together has appeared to historians insufficient to explain the whole result, unless, in addition, some comparatively high culture can be supposed to have already been established when and where the Greek settlements came to be planted. For this reason the hypothesis of the pre-existence in western Anatolia of a proto-Ionian race, Hellenic but not European, has been put forward. If anything like the usual signification is to be attached to the term Hellenic, the hypothesis is untenable. But it served, and serves still, to call attention to the probable fact that some civilization, which, though 'barbarian,' as Greeks used this word, rose far above barbarism, was possessed and practised by a race or races already domiciled on the west Anatolian coast at the moment that the first Hellenic settlers arrived.

It would have been unnecessary to call attention to the contradiction offered by the foundation-legends of the primary Asiatic colonies to any contention that they were founded *in vacuo*, were it not for the insistence of modern historians on esoteric geographical knowledge shown by the western oracles in directing Hellenic colonists, and on the admirable topographical choices made by the colonists themselves. This insistence leaves students with the impression that, in most instances, the colonies were planted on coasts previously unknown to Greeks, and devoid of urban settlements. On the contrary, Greek belief held that in Asia Minor, at any rate, bands of Hellenes were introduced at very various times and by very various processes into pre-existent towns. In its view the credit for the selection of their sites rested, therefore, with the pre-Hellenic peoples. In fact, credit is not due to anyone in particular. The towns which the Greeks found were the fittest which had survived an evolutionary process centuries old. Village settlements had grown into towns, or remained villages, or dwindled away, under the selective influence of local natural conditions—here, a sheltered inlet compared to, there, an open strand swept by surf or currents; here, good and abundant water, there, scanty and bad; at the back of one locality easy gradients and healthy tracks to the interior, contrasted with the confused hills, forests, marshes or malarious and fly-haunted valleys behind another.

To whomsoever it assigned the credit, the fact remains that Greek tradition gave to Hellenes the first settlement of hardly

any spot on the west Asiatic coast which eventually was occupied by a Greek colony; still more rarely did it ascribe first settlement to any 'Hellenes' whose Hellenism can stand examination by our present knowledge of the pre-Hellenes. A summary synthesis of the foundation-legends of the principal west Asiatic colonies shows that those held responsible for their original settlement were as follows: Pre-Hellenic Cretans ('Telchines' who lived in the time of the gods and were connected with the foreign deity, Poseidon) for Rhodes (in part), Erythrae, Chios (part) and Magnesia ad Sipylum (part); Pelasgians for Cnidus (its founder was a son of Poseidon), Chios (part), Clazomenae, Lesbos (part), and Cyzicus; Amazons (*i.e.* some Asiatic power) for Ephesus, Smyrna, Cyme, Myrina and, perhaps, Colophon; Carians or Leleges (or both) for Rhodes (part), Halicarnassus, Mylasa, Miletus, Priene, Samos, Lebedos, and Chios (part); Lydians for Adramyttium, and some pre-Hellenic element of the Troad for Lampsacus and Abydos, princes of which towns were joined with Priam against the Achaeans. Another pre-Hellenic element, the Heliadae or 'Sons of the Sun,' preceded the Hellenes in Rhodes, Cos and Lesbos. Teos, whose inscriptions display, as it happens, a remarkable proportion of non-Greek names, began as a Minyan city; and 'Cadmeians' were held partly responsible for early Rhodes, where Lindus, Camirus, and Ialysus were already cities before the Trojan War or the coming of any Dorian Argives. The three great oracular sanctuaries of Greek Asia, at Patara, Branchidae, and Notium (Clarium)—all, be it noted, sacred to Apollo, a deity usually supposed to have been of Asiatic origin—were in existence before the advent of Hellenes. The last-named advised the Homeric hero, Mopsus; and Branchidae seems to have been a sanctuary of an Asiatic sky god (Zeus Branchus) before it was one of Apollo.

This summary leaves no primary colonies of the first class, except, perhaps, Phocaea, to be claimed for Hellenic founders in virtue of beliefs held by Greeks themselves. It has often been remarked that the *Iliad* betrays no knowledge of a Greek element on the mainland of Asia, and cites Miletus as a city of the barbarous-speaking Carians. The early Ionian author, Pherecydes, is quoted by Strabo as evidence that the Ionian colonists, on arrival, found all the central section of the west coast held, as to the northern part, by Leleges, and as to the southern, by Carians. With these, we are told that the colonists mixed their blood so thoroughly that Ionians of the west, *e.g.* the Athenians, never regarded them as pure kin. In one instance we hear of Greek

settlers building a new fort near an old city. Phocians from Thermopylae founded Neonteichos, near Cyme; but when they got possession of the latter, they deserted their earlier foundation. It is an exception which, by bearing implicit testimony to the pre-Hellenic existence of Cyme, proves our rule.

III. THE EARLIER 'CARO-LELEGIAN' CIVILIZATION

What civilization (or civilizations), then, can have been occupying the west Anatolian coast when the first Hellenic settlers arrived? by what race or races developed and enjoyed? and how far, on our present knowledge, to be esteemed capable of exercising sufficient educative influence on those settlers to help to account for their subsequent aptitude for humanism? On the evidence of tradition, the racial term Caro-Lelegian may be attributed to such a civilization more generally and fitly than any other; for it is not only in the southern section of the coast, from Caunus round to Lebedos and on Samos and Chios, but also in the central section, according to Pherecydes, and in the Troad, according to Aristotle, that we hear of Caro-Lelegians at an early period. So far, then, as any one racial element can be said to have held the west Asiatic coast during a period immediately preceding that of Greek colonization, it is this.

According to the tradition, also, this pre-Hellenic society was contaminated by two considerable alien bodies, one composed of elements from beyond the western sea, in which Cretans and Pelasgians figure prominently; the other of elements from the interior, implied in the Phrygian relations of both the Troad and the Smyrna district and in the Amazonian legends attached to cities of the central coast. From such a racial stock, affected by such contributory influences, a civilization mixed of western and eastern elements in equal parts is to be expected. The western element in this should be predominant, and be Aegeo-Cretan of the Late Minoan kind; the eastern, of inferior strength, should be compounded of Phrygo-Cappadocian ingredients derived overland, and of Egypto-Syrian ingredients derived oversea, some Mesopotamian inspiration being infused into both ingredients.

As has been implied already, our archaeological knowledge of the remains of the earliest periods of culture on the west Anatolian littoral is very far from sufficient to test thoroughly the truth of such a hypothesis as is stated here. But so far as that knowledge goes, it supports our hypothesis, inasmuch as objects of Late Minoan fabric and derivation have turned up from time to time

at points all along the coast-line from Caria up to the Troad. Indeed they have been found whenever and wherever strata or tombs of any age near to that of the first Greek settlement have been explored. In Caria, Telmissus has produced one fortuitous piece of evidence, a 'stirrup-vase' of late type now in the British Museum. But on the Myndus peninsula at Assarlik, probably the site of the Lelegian Termera, there was found, in the excavation of a chambered tumulus which had been half-robbed, ample proof that its grave-furniture had represented a civilization of the latest Minoan-Mycenaean kind; while subsequent explorations established the fact that, at least on this peninsula, a culture of early Cycladic type was succeeded by one strongly influenced by the later Aegeo-Cretan culture. A fine vase of this latter period, from Mylasa, is in the Evangelical School at Smyrna; while, from Stratonicea in the interior and from Changli, near the site of the Panionium on Mount Mycale, have come other vases of the later Cycladic types, of which Phylakopi in Melos yielded an abundant harvest. In the interspace, at Miletus, sherds of the latest Minoan-Mycenaean style were found predominating in the earth under the Athena temple, the only spot within the city which has been explored deeply. Farther to the north, Myrina has yielded the same pottery; and the 'Mycenaean' character of the vases and other remains of the 'Sixth City' at Hissarlik is very well known. The geographical gaps between these divers points have not yet been explored for strata and tombs of the age in question—not even the gap which includes almost all Ionia, although considerable search has been made in its soil for later remains. The earliest stratum there explored was on the site of the Ephesian Artemisium; but at the bottom of all human remains there, the excavator had not penetrated behind the eighth century B.C.

Before, and probably long before, the introduction of this comparatively late influence of the Aegean, the existence, in western Anatolia, of a widely-spread native civilization which was related to that of the Cyclades, is established by sporadic but sufficient evidence. It has been mentioned already that remains of it were found in Caria, the chief item of evidence being the type of tomb which precedes that associated with objects of Late Minoan style. Unmistakable vases of this earlier culture, which have come from points as far inland as Dinair (Celaenae-Apamea) in Phrygia and as Isbarta in Pisidia, and as far round the south coast as western Pamphylia, have been collected into the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. They are chiefly beaked jugs

of burnished brown ware, decorated with incised vandykes and zigzags, and remarkably similar, in form, in treatment of surface and in ornament, to the contents of the early Melian cemetery at Pelos. With such pottery were found marble idols both of Cycladic types and also of a distinct type well known on the Thracian coast of the Aegean and in the Danube region.

Of slightly later period are vessels of similar shapes (also to be seen in the Ashmolean) decorated in white pigment with the same general schemes of ornament as the incised vases. These show that the culture lasted a considerable time and went through the ordinary process of ceramic development. The early village site at Kiliktepé, near Miletus, is also of this culture, to judge by the preliminary report of its excavation. Its inhabitants used hand-made pottery burnished and decorated with incised zigzags, and also obsidian knives, which must have been imported from Melos. These stone implements, it should be observed, do not necessarily imply a neolithic date: their use was maintained far into the age of bronze over all the Aegean area. Vases found at Yortan in Mysia and Bighadich in the Troad (now in the Louvre, the British Museum and the Ashmolean) repeat the Isbarta forms, but with surface treatment more like that of early Bosnian vases at Butmir; and the resemblance to Danubian fabrics is as strong in the pre-Mycenaean wares of Hissarlik as we should expect in close proximity to the Hellespont. At the same time, these Trojan wares, like all the rest cited above, belong essentially to the Aegean cycle of production. Scanty and scattered as are these items of evidence, they are enough to impose the conclusion that, for a long age previous to the introduction of Minoan-Mycenaean influence, west Asia Minor had preserved a culture so near akin to the Cycladic as to imply the inhabitation of both isles and Asiatic coast by populations generally of one stock and a common history.

If we turn back to the Greek literary tradition and combine this with what is known of historical Leleges and Carians, who survived into the classical period—both still were recognized peoples in the fourth century B.C. and even later—we find much that argues not only a wide range for them in early times, but also ample opportunity for the reception of Cretan and other Helladic cultural influences by a civilization of the west Anatolian coast. Since the Greeks themselves disputed whether Leleges and Carians were two sections of one people or distinct peoples (p. 8), it would be futile now to try to decide the question. In any case they are most intimately linked in the tradition which records

their simultaneous presence on the Greek mainland, in the Aegean islands and on the Asiatic mainland. They coexisted even in Caria itself, where Philip of Theangela, speaking with local knowledge, says the Leleges had in his time a servile status. Herodotus, Thucydides and Strabo alike put them into a relation with Minoan Crete. Though they were not themselves peoples of that island (actual Minoan Cretans, so far as they are known to have migrated permanently, took a western, not an eastern direction), they were subjects or enemies of its king. Minos drove the Carians out of the islands, says Thucydides; or he made galley-slaves of them, as Herodotus states. They are credited with having ruled the sea at one epoch, and Cretans remembered them, according to Herodotus, among the more famous peoples of the olden time. That, in fact, they did once hold the Cyclades is attested by Thucydides' story about the Carian graves opened on Delos in his own time: but the belief of Carians themselves was that their main seat had always been on the south-west Anatolian littoral; and their Asianic speech supports their story.

If any estimate of the quality of Caro-Lelegian culture is to be formed, certain facts must be noted. The Carians had been in contact, more or less intimate, with Minoan Cretans; they were bold sea-rovers of whom we hear in early traditions of towns on the Black Sea, such as Tanais (their speech is probably to be detected in such names as Odessus, Hermonassa and Salmydessus); and they were a literate people, for they had a peculiar Asianic script of their own, epigraphic specimens of which survive. Further, Thucydides believed that their armament was better than that of the Hellenic settlers, since these adopted their helmets and shields with the plumes and the grips. His view of their military competence is supported by the well-known fact that at least as early as the seventh century B.C. Carians were much in request as soldiers of fortune. The *Iliad* is an early authority for their practice of fine handicrafts in metal, ivory and leather. Later authors add the cutting of precious stones and purple-dyeing, and credit them with a metric system, with improvements in ship-building, with refinements of music and the invention of certain musical modes, with an apparatus for writing, and with some improved form of mill for grinding corn. These, or some of these, achievements may stand to the credit of later Carian generations than are yet in question; but most of them smack of early Aegean days. It is, in any case, clear that Greek literary tradition regarded the early Caro-Lelegians as possessed of a relatively high culture; and the positive evidence of archaeology

all tends to relate their civilization to that of Late Minoan Crete, and of Mycenaean Greece. Almost everything has yet to be learned about the social organization of the 'Late Minoan' world. It need not be inferred from the poorer quality of its art products, that its civilization, as a whole, was inferior to that of the full Minoan age. History demonstrates in all ages that the organization of societies, political, economic and domestic, is not only maintained but improved after the decline of periods of great art, which mark aristocratic semi-feudal stages of racial development. The subsequent and more democratic stages lose something in art, but advance in material wealth, in domestic comfort and in the political education of a larger number of persons. Minoan-Mycenaean society may well have been able to exercise a higher and wider influence, in its later ages than in its earlier, on the Caro-Lelegians, and, through them, on the earliest Greek settlers in Asia.

About the other influences exercised, from the opposite eastern quarter, upon the pre-Hellenic civilization of the west Anatolian littoral, Greek tradition has, naturally, much less to say, and our opinion must be based more upon archaeological data. The tradition does, indeed, record memories of frequent early relations between Carians and 'Phoenicians,' whether these were 'Cadmeians,' or men from the Syrian coast. There was an early social union of the two races in Rhodes; and Athenaeus cites Corinna and Bacchylides as authorities for a 'Phoenician' Caria. Thales, the Milesian, was said by some to have had Phoenician forbears: and there are names, personal and local, common to the Carian and the Phoenician areas. The prosecution of active trade along the Anatolian coast by these carriers of 'Assyrian cargoes' (as Herodotus says of the Phoenicians) is reflected clearly enough in the *Iliad* and in the early traditions of Hellespontine towns, such as Abydos and Lampsacus. It is illustrated also, for a somewhat later age, by the objects of Phoenico-Egyptian fabric and style found in great abundance in the soil of Rhodes. The cultural value of Phoenician relations may be estimated variously; but that their influence on artistic fabrics and motives in western Anatolia was considerable must be allowed to the champions of a Semitic share in the evolution of Hellenic art. Certainly, by whomsoever introduced, oriental decorative motives offer in the Carian region, by the pottery, metal and faïence fabrics of Rhodes and Miletus, the most conspicuous, and probably the earliest, evidence of their influence upon Hellenic manufacture.

Some cultural solidarity between Asiatic Carians and the other

Asiatic societies, which lay behind them in Lydia, Lycia and Phrygia, might safely be presumed, even if there were no such Greek testimony to it as is given by the well-known statement about the participation of Lydians and Mysians in the Carian cult of Mylasa, or, even if we had not the philological evidence of homonymies. It is worthy of remark that what the Greeks regarded as typical Carian armament is represented on monuments of several inland peoples, in Phrygia, in Cappadocia, and even in north Syria. More will be said generally upon these inland civilizations of western Asia Minor in a subsequent volume. While the earlier Asiatic culture of Lycia is still sealed from us, that of Lydia is being tapped by the American excavation of Sardes; and monumental evidence about the Phrygian has long been known. This last, and with it (or through its mediation) Cappadocian culture, undoubtedly exercised, like the Lydian, the most direct and potent effect on the Ionian section of the littoral, where Pherecydes expressly tells us the Lelegians were in possession before any Hellenes, and already had built Ephesus. As for the Aeolic section, we have not only evidence in the *Iliad* of its intimate connection with Phrygia, but strong archaeological proof, in the earlier strata of Hissarlik, of some cultural solidarity between the Troad and Hattic Cappadocia.

IV. THE PROCESS OF SETTLEMENT

Greek tradition regarded the process of Hellenic settlement in Asia as having been not only spread over a long period of time, but effected in very various ways. On the whole, except for the epic Achaean struggle for footing in the Troad, and a story told by Herodotus concerning the advent of the Ionians to Miletus, it believed that gradual infiltration rather than sudden violence was the rule, especially in the settlement of Ionia. At Erythrae, a small body of Hellenes introduced itself into a 'barbarian' community, which tolerated them for their knowledge of trade and superior arts of life, until the new-comers found themselves able to take the lead. At Chios, the islanders, who long stood out of the Ionian 'League, came in voluntarily in the end. Inter-marriage of Greek men and Asiatic women was to be expected on the general analogy of early colonization, and because Greeks were not much concerned to preserve their purity of race. We hear of it as a general practice of the Ionian settlers; and there is a well-known instance of a Greek princess of Cyme marrying a Phrygian. If Miletus was, in any way, exceptional in this regard

(Herodotus' manner of telling the story of the rape of the Carian women may be thought to suggest something unusual), the resultant impurity of its civic blood (though the Milesians themselves boasted pure Ionism) may help to account for certain features of its character and history, for instance, for the superior vigour and enterprise of its citizens, conspicuously displayed in its prodigal foundation of secondary colonies and factories.

The primary Greek settlements very early threw out secondary ones into their immediate neighbourhoods. So Miletus founded Iasos, and Cyme and Lesbos peopled all their neighbouring coasts and islets. All the western or Aegean littoral and the Propontic coast, with one ultimate outpost on the Black Sea, Heracleia Pontica, came to be occupied before the historic age began. The rest of the Euxine shores had to wait for the secondary expansion of Miletus. On the south coast of Asia Minor we do not meet with primary Hellenic colonization east of Rhodes, till the Cilician-Cypriote group of cities, already spoken of, is reached; but there appear to have been settlements of Greeks, which were rather of the nature of factories, in Pamphylian towns, such as Phaselis (reckoned, strictly speaking, Lycian), Perga and Aspendus, whose populations, like their names, remained predominantly native; and also in Cilician towns such as Tarsus. Of colonies planted in the interior at a greater distance than usually divided Greek cities and their proper port-towns (Colophon and Notium stood in this mutual relation, the citizens of the two being equally Colophonians, dwelling respectively at the 'old city' and 'the sea-side') we hear only in the Maeander and Hermus valleys. Magnesia ad Maeandrum and Tralles claimed origins as early as any coastal settlements; so did also the other Magnesia, under Sipylos.

The next Greek attempts at secondary colonization were directed to the southern coast. Cyme is said to have been the first Asiatic Greek city to become the mother of a 'foreign' colony, when she planted a group of settlers at Side in Pamphylia; but they soon lapsed to barbarism. Rhodes established two small factories on the central Lycian coast, and joined with some Dorians, whose origin is unknown, to colonize Soli in Cilicia. Samos occupied Nagidos and Celenderis in western Cilicia. Little, if anything, more seems to have been attempted in these regions; and perhaps some indication of a sufficient deterrent cause is conveyed by a record of Sargon of Assyria (late eighth century), who boasts that his fleets had chased and caught ships of Javan 'like fish' in the Cyprian seas, and given peace to Cilicia and

Tyre. In any case, the Greeks were bound to meet formidable competitors as soon as they tried to enter the easternmost Levant. Since Lycia is mostly Alpine mountains, which bar trade with the interior, while Pamphylia is largely marsh-land and hardly less closed behind, and western Cilicia is a very rugged land, eastern or plain Cilicia can have been the only considerable district of the southern littoral to be desired; and here, as has been already argued, too old and well organized a society, inclusive of some long-established Greeks, existed to leave much room or opportunity for foreign colonization.

The Syrian and Egyptian coasts were virtually closed to colonists from overseas; but we do find a Greek (Yāwāni) ruling Ashdod in 720 B.C., and a Milesian factory was already established somewhere on the lowest reaches of the Canopic Nile before the foundation of that general Greek settlement at Naucratis, which falls early in the sixth century (possibly earlier if Milesians were, indeed, there before other Greeks). Except for this sustained effort to capture Egyptian trade, the greatest Asiatic mother of colonies, Miletus, seems to have turned her attention wholly northwards—to the coasts of the Straits, the Propontis and the Black Sea. There, in the wake of the 'Argo,' she expected no serious competitor, and, unlike the eastern Levant, all shores were open. Though it is too much to say that she simply carried on earlier Carian enterprise in the Euxine, the direction of her efforts was probably influenced both by Carian tradition and by the local knowledge of Pontic coasts possessed by the Carian element in her population. The 'thalassocracy,' lasting eighteen years, with which Eusebius credits Miletus, must be taken to mark the inception of the amazing expansive effort which (according to a probably exaggerated tradition) eventually left the northern shores of Asia Minor settled at more than seventy points by Milesian colonists. The date given by Eusebius for this thalassocracy falls in the latter half of the eighth century, and there seems no sufficient reason for transferring it to any later moment.

The secondary expansion of Miletus, begun soon after the middle of the eighth century, was sustained far into the seventh. We are told that, as late as the time of Gyges of Lydia, she absorbed the old Aeolian town of Abydos on the Hellespont; and still later, she colonized Odessus, Apollonia Pontica and a few more. Since among the earliest of her settlements were some on the Crimean coast, for example, Panticapaeum, it looks as if the Milesians, in their first northward ventures, had shunned the

shores of the Straits and the Marmora, where Greek settlers were established already, and had made rather for coasts where Greek claims had not yet been pegged out. When after a generation or two her daughter-towns came to dominate the Euxine, control its trade, and possess ships enough of their own to overawe opposition, Miletus ventured to seize ancient holdings of Greeks. A decree of Apollonia on the Rhyndacus, found at Miletus, makes it clear that fighting took place here and there on the occasion of such seizures. Certain of the daughter-towns became mothers in their turn. Details become more abundant at the late date of such foundations, and we are allowed to see that not all owed their origin to patriotic volunteers setting forth to increase the trade of their native cities. Some (Sinope offers an instance, and it may be that the latest Milesian colonies of the Tyrant era supply others) were the result of the expulsion, or voluntary exile, of groups of disaffected or defeated partisans.

The motive which impelled them had doubtless operated often enough during the great days of colonization in the oligarchical period. Where land and privilege were in very few hands, but at the same time all of Greek blood were aristocrats in comparison with the native populations among which they lived, the attraction of self-exile to a new scene of political life, and a novel opportunity of power must have been very great. Nor is it difficult to understand why both oligarchs and tyrants encouraged such migrations, seeing that, at one stroke they rid the home state of discontented elements and enlarged the range of its commercial primacy. For it was a rule of Greek secondary expansion that a colony modelled itself on its mother, maintained continuous relations with her, and preserved jealously the memory of its origin. The general identity of cults in colonies and mother-cities illustrates this attitude. A pact with four colonies has come to light at Miletus, who justly prided herself on being a creator of cities, and in an inscription of a later age boasts herself not only the eldest of Ionian settlements, but also the mother of many and great cities in Pontus and Egypt and many other parts of the habitable world.


Though none was nearly so prolific as she, other Asiatic cities sent out secondary colonies far and wide—Samos, for example, not only to Asia but to Macedonia and Sicily; Teos, to the Cimmerian Bosphorus; Colophon, to southern Italy; Clazomenae, to both sides of the Hellespont; Chios, to Thrace; Phocaea, to the Hellespont and Euxine, as well as western seas. Of Cyme and Rhodes in this respect something has been said already. The enterprise of almost all the primary Asiatic settlements met in

the maintenance of Naucratis, Miletus claiming primacy and special privilege, but the other Ionian cities having their places in the Egyptian sun. Whence it results, by an irony of fate, that we have recovered more evidence of Ionian art from a settlement in Egypt than from all Ionia itself. Indeed, till the early ~~st~~ data on the Artemisium site of Ephesus were explored in 1904-5, our best witness to the products of early Ionia had to be summoned from places so remote on the one hand as Naucratis and Daphnae in the delta of the Nile, and, on the other, as Vettertsfelde in Lusatia.

INDEX TO NAMES

(C=Chalcolithic, N=Neolithic, P=Paleolithic)

- Alava, C;
 Alcaiz, B;
 Alentejo, B;
 Algarve, B;
 Algeria, D-3, 4
 Almería, C;
 Antiochia, BC;
 Anzeiy Lake, E;
 Antioquia, C;
 Argar, EI, C;
 Asturias, B;
 Balearic Isles, D;
 Beira, D;
 Carnai, C;
 Carthage, F;
 Castellón, F;
 Catalonia, D;
 Celben, C;
 Compostela, C;
 Cumerana, N-M, 1, 2
 Cagil, D;
 Constantine, E;
 Corsica, E;
 Crete, HI, 3, 4
 Cyprus, K, 3, 4
 Danube, R, F-1, 1, 2
 Dardani, H, 2 and 1, 2
 Douro, R, B;
 Elbe, R, C;
 El Argar, C;
 Elbe, R, F
 Epirus, GH, 2, 3
 Estremadura, BC;
 Etruria, F;
 Galia, E;
 Galicia, B;
 Gallia, CD, 1, 2
 Garsone, R, CD, 2
 Gavina, C;
 Germania, ERG
 Gersua, D;
 Gladstone, E;
 Gibraltar, B;
 Gorn, F;
 Greece, H;
 Guadalupe, R, BC;
 Guadiana, R, B;
 Hadrumetum, F;
 Hippo Diarrhyon, F;
 Hippo Regius, E;
 Hispania, BC;
 Hyria, G;
 Inessee, F;
 Italia, FG;
 Iria, D;
 Lampedusa, F;
 La Tène, E;
 Latium, F;
 Lepus magna (?), F;
 Ligures, E;
 Liron, B;
 Lure, R, C;
 Los Milanes, C;
 Macedonia, H;
 Majorca, D;
 Malta, F;
 Maurasia, C;
 Megan Hyblaea, C;
 Messapia, G;
 Minio, R, B;
 Minorca, D;
 Moesia, HI, 2
 Morocco, BC;
 Mugra, B;
 Murcia, C;
 Navarra, C;
 Oran, C;
 Orizuela, B;
 Oriz, F;
 Palermo, F;
 Palmetto, B;
 Pantelleria, F;
 Rhine, R, E;
 Rhone, R, D, 1, 2
 Saire, R, DEI
 Sardinia, E, 3
 Sarmatians, IRL
 Scythians, LMI
 Seine, R, D;
 Sevilla, B;
 Sicilia, FG;
 Sonnello, G;
 Syrtis Minor, F;
 Tagus, R, B;
 Talavera de la Reina, B;
 Tébesa, E;
 Termini, F;
 Tirs Omonte, B;
 Tripoli, FG;
 Trionis Lake, E;
 Tuna, EF;
 Umbi, F;
 Utica, F;
 Venezia, F;



CHAPTER XXI

THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

I. ITALY AND SICILY

TRACES of man are not wanting in Italy in the palaeolithic period. Controversy still rages round the remains of human skeletons said to have been found in pliocene deposits at various places, notably Castenedolo near Brescia, and Olmo near Arezzo, but it is at least beyond doubt that stone implements of both Chellean and Mousterian types have been found in several parts of the peninsula, and Mousterian also in Sicily. The earliest of the famous deposits in the Ligurian caves, so long an object of controversy, are now universally admitted to be of Mousterian type. It is still true to say that the later phases of the French palaeolithic periods are, as a series, without exact parallel in Italy. At the same time recent discoveries have made it clear that the country was not without inhabitants during the long period which separated the neolithic from the older palaeolithic. The implements found in the upper levels of the Ligurian caves are now recognized as pre-neolithic, and bear quite a remarkable resemblance to those of the Aurignacian in France. The burials, too, found in these strata are almost beyond reasonable doubt palaeolithic in date. In other caves in Italy deposits have been found which correspond closely to the upper strata of the Ligurian caves, notably in the Grotta Romanelli, near Lecce in Apulia, and in several caves and rock shelters in the neighbourhood of Falerii in north Latium. Despite the parallels with the Aurignacian, the exact genetic and temporal relation of these deposits to similar deposits in other parts of Europe and in north Africa is a question which it would be at present unwise to attempt to answer.

With the beginning of the neolithic period we are on slightly firmer ground. We find the peninsula in possession of a people who are acquainted with the making of pottery and the polishing of stone, and whose physical characteristics are remarkably homogeneous over the whole country. This last fact has led to the enunciation of the theory that at the close of the palaeolithic era Italy received a new population from outside, which brought

with it the arts of making pottery and of polishing stone. This theory took definite form in the hands of the Roman anthropologist Sergi. On measuring a large number of skulls, both ancient and modern, from various parts of the Mediterranean basin and the adjoining lands, he found that certain types of dolichocephalic skull, such as those which, from their contour as seen from above, he named the ellipsoid, ovoid and pentagonoid, were apt to recur in almost every part of the area examined. The owners of these various forms of long skull, which include the ancient Egyptians, and the early inhabitants of Spain, Italy, north Africa, Greece and parts of Asia Minor, Sergi has grouped together under the name of the Mediterranean Race. This race he supposes to have had its origin in east Africa and to have spread from this source into Egypt, into north Africa, and thence by way of the islands and straits into the south of Europe, carrying with it certain cultural elements typical of the neolithic period in all those regions.

With regard to Italy in particular this theory has met with wide acceptance. To that particular branch of Sergi's Mediterranean Race which is supposed to have invaded Italy the name Liguri has been given by Italian archaeologists¹. The Ligurians or Ligures of Roman times were regarded by both Greek and Roman historians as the descendants of the primitive occupants of the peninsula. Their habits certainly lend support to this belief, and it seems clear that at one time they extended far beyond the limits of Liguria. They even, according to some authorities, occupied a portion of south-east France.

Sergi's theory has at least provided a very useful working hypothesis, but there is little doubt that in the near future it will have to undergo the fire of keen criticism. There are already signs of a tendency to believe in very considerable survivals of the palaeolithic peoples in Spain into the neolithic era, and the discovery in France of what appear to be transitional stages between palaeolithic and neolithic, as for example the Azilian, emphasize the necessity for caution². Pigorini has long pointed to the

¹ More frequently the invaders of Italy and Spain are grouped together under the name Ibero-Liguri.

² Sir William Boyd Dawkins, however, points out that the thick stratum of loam without human remains which separates the Upper Magdalenian from the Azilian stratum in the cavern of Mas d'Azil may well mark a geological and cultural break at this point in pre-history. He adds that though pottery was not found in the Azilian stratum it may have existed there, in so primitive and poorly baked a form that its remains are no longer recognizable.

occurrence of certain palaeolithic types of flint implement in the neolithic period in the Monti Lessini, near Verona, as a possible indication of the survival of the pre-neolithic people, and Fleure is inclined to see in certain abnormal types of skull in modern Wales the survival of an Aurignacian population there (see p. 596).

The newcomers (if such they were) lived in caves and rock-shelters, or in huts whose foundations were hollowed out of the ground so as to afford greater protection against the elements. The huts themselves were generally circular in form, and built of nothing more substantial than wattle and daub. Their inhabitants were a primitive folk, ignorant of metal, armed with simple tools and weapons of flaked flint, and with polished celts of such materials as jadeite, nephrite and chloromelanite. In the earlier days of their sojourn in Italy the bow and arrow were probably unknown to them, and though they were a pastoral people, they had not as yet domesticated the dog. They possessed very definite ideas as to the disposal of the dead. These were inhumed, never cremated, in a more or less tightly contracted position, frequently on the left side, either in caves or in simple trench-graves in the open. In some cases it is inferred from the position of the bones in the tomb that the flesh had been removed from the skeleton before burial, and in many instances the body is covered with red ochre, or lumps of red ochre are buried with it. The dead are generally accompanied by an assortment of objects, implements of flint, ornaments of shell, and pottery, which in some cases appear to have been intentionally broken. These customs, which are observed in almost every part of the country and the islands around it, point to quite definite and similar beliefs with regard to death and burial over the whole area in question.

The pottery of these people varied slightly from place to place. That of the hut-foundations of the north, especially those of the Po valley, is coarse and generally unattractive, rarely incised, but occasionally ornamented by strips of clay laid over the surface in relief, and pitted, or otherwise marked, by the finger or a stick. In the south, especially at Matera and the Palo di Molfetta, a much more highly developed pottery occurs. Here we find well-made wares with brown or black surface and a good polish, decorated with incised designs either before or after the firing. But side by side with this we have a number of vases of true painted ware, not merely of one type but of several. In Sicily too, particularly in the south-east of the island, at Stentinello and Matrensa, and lately at Megara Hyblaea, have been found

incised wares of great variety of design, quite different from anything which north Italy produced, and with these a few rare pieces of painted ware. These rather striking differences between north Italy on the one hand and south Italy with Sicily on the other, suggest that, as might have been expected on geographical grounds, the south was in closer touch than the north with the more advanced parts of the Mediterranean area, such as Crete and the Aegean, where painted pottery reached a high development in neolithic times.

The coming of copper effected no revolution in the pre-history of the Italian mainland. Apparently there was no change of population. Men continued to live in huts and in caves, and to inhumate their dead in trenches in the earth, though the contraction of the bodies became less tight, the legs in many cases being merely slightly bent. Flint-working improved in quality, despite the introduction of the first clumsy instruments of copper. The best-known cemeteries of the period are those of Remedello, near Brescia, and of Fontanella Mantovana, but isolated finds in other places tend to show that the use of copper diffused itself gradually over most of the country. About the same time appear the first stone implements bored through for hafting, in the form of hammer-axes and spherical or pear-shaped mace-heads.

Such was the Copper or Chalcolithic Age on the Italian mainland. But in the islands it ran a somewhat different course. Both in Sicily and in Sardinia the Copper Age is marked by the appearance of the first rock-hewn sepulchres, and it is to the same period that we must attribute the beginnings of megalithic architecture in its various forms of dolmens, Giants' Tombs and *nuraghi*. Whether megalithic building and rock sepulchres in these islands are of foreign origin, and whether both are to be attributed to the same influences, be they of trade or of immigration, are questions which at present have not been satisfactorily answered. A similar obscurity surrounds the origin of the first copper used in Italy. Is it connected with the sudden appearance in the islands at almost the same moment of rock tombs and megalithic monuments? These are doubtless problems which cannot be solved by the Italian evidence alone, and different authorities find different answers to them according to their various beliefs as to the origin of copper, of megalithic monuments, and of rock tombs in general. At the same time there can hardly be any doubt that the distribution of the two last in Italy and her islands is significant. Megalithic buildings are common in Sardinia, and there are a considerable number (twelve menhirs and seventeen small dolmens) in

Terra d' Otranto¹, in the heel of Italy, and a few in the neighbourhood of Barletta (thirteen menhirs and four large dolmens besides the Bisceglie tomb, which is a corridor tomb of considerable size). In Sicily no true megalithic monuments have as yet been found. The rock-cut tomb, on the other hand, is common in Sicily, Sardinia and Pianosa, but rare in Italy, where we have but three or four examples from the Copper Age in central Italy, and several of Bronze Age in the south. The complete absence of both megalithic monuments and rock tombs in north Italy certainly suggests that, whatever be their relation one to the other, we should look for the origin of both somewhere in the Mediterranean rather than in central Europe.

However this may be, it is beyond doubt that south Italy and the islands were during this period in increasingly close touch with the more developed centres of civilization in the Aegean and elsewhere in the Mediterranean area. Thus in Sicily and Sardinia blocks of raw copper, clearly imports, have been found. Obsidian is fairly common over the whole area in question, while the forms of some of the pottery, as, for example, the beaked jug, almost certainly have their prototypes in the Aegean or thereabouts. To the same origin may with less certainty be traced the rapid development of painted pottery in Sicily in the chalcolithic period, and the spiral decorations carved on the closing-slabs of two of the rock tombs of Castelluccio, in the south-east corner of the island. From this same cemetery comes an object of bone ornamented with a peculiar incised design: an object so exactly similar to this was found in the Second City at Hissarlik that there can scarcely be a doubt of their having come from the same source.

With the beginnings of the Bronze Age new influences came into operation in Italy. Already towards the end of the Copper Age the great lakes of Piedmont, Lombardy and the Veneto had been inhabited by men who built their houses on piles in the shallow margins of the lakes (vol. 1, p. 72). Some believe that these people were simply the old Ibero-Liguri of the neolithic period. On the other hand, the Bronze Age cemeteries from this area show the funeral rite of cremation², and, though we have no tombs from

¹ The age of the *specchie* (great masses of stones heaped up in the form of a flattened cone to the height of 30 feet or so) of Terra d' Otranto is as yet uncertain; while the *trulli* or *truddhi* of Apulia are modern stone huts, resembling the *nuraghi* of Sardinia, but are built in steps or terraces and have no upper chamber.

² Cf. vol. 1, p. 110. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the statement which has found its way into many text-books in this country to the effect that the *terremare*-folk inhumed their dead is quite erroneous.

the Copper Age, we have certain reasons for supposing that if we could but find these they would show the same rite. If this should prove to be the case it will be necessary to suppose the immigration of a new element to account for this complete change of custom, and it is to this new element, entering Italy perhaps from the direction of Switzerland, where pile-dwellings are frequent in early times, that most Italian archaeologists would attribute the Copper Age pile-structures of the lakes.

On this subject there is considerable difference of opinion. Practically all, however, are agreed that at a rather later date, the beginning of the Bronze Age, a new people entered the eastern half of north Italy, probably from the direction of the Danube. These people, who cremated their dead, as their cemeteries prove, settled first in the eastern lakes, notably Lake Garda, and then, when their increasing numbers made further expansion necessary, moved southward into the provinces of Mantova, Brescia and Cremona. Finally they crossed the Po and planted their settlements in the southern part of the river valley right up to the foot of the Apennines. But though they had ceased to live in lakes they continued to build their houses on piles, and so originated the famous *terremare*¹ or pile-dwellings on dry land. The structure of a *terramara* is as follows. It is four-sided, with the two longer sides parallel. The whole is surrounded by a rampart of earth supported on the inside by a wooden buttress. Outside the rampart is a moat, sometimes nearly 100 feet across, filled by a constantly-flowing stream of water from the nearest available tributary of the Po, which enters at the sharpest corner of the moat and has an outlet in one of the long sides. Within the rampart is the pile-settlement, divided up by two sets of parallel roads at right angles the one to the other. In the eastern half of the *terramara* is a mass of heaped-up earth, rectangular in plan, in some cases nearly 100 yards by 50 in area, and surrounded by a moat over 30 feet across. This is undoubtedly the *arx* or *templum* of the settlement. On it there was no pile structure such as that which occupied the remainder of the *terramara*. It was entered on its west side by a bridge. In its centre was dug a trench about twenty-five

¹ The term *terra marna* has long been used by the peasants of the Parma district to describe a certain kind of rich earth much prized by them as a fertilizer. When it was discovered that the localities in which this earth was obtained were the sites of pile-dwellings, and that the richness of the soil was derived from the amount of decayed animal and vegetable matter which it contained, the phrase *terra marna* or, as often pronounced, *terra mara* was transferred by archaeologists to the pile-dwelling itself, and finally written as one word *terramara*. The plural is, of course, not *terramare* but *terremare*.

yards long by five broad, in the bottom of which were excavated, at regular intervals, five pits each $1\frac{1}{2}$ yards deep. These contained potsherds, animal bones, flint flakes and shells, and are believed to be ritual pits dug at the foundation of the settlement, at which time the outline of the whole was also marked out by the plough.

The inhabitants of the *terremare* were in the main an agricultural people, and in this respect were far in advance of their neolithic predecessors, whose notions of agriculture were probably very primitive. In the *terremare* we find remains of flax, beans, two species of wheat, and also the grape, though this last perhaps not in a cultivated form. These people lived in the full age of bronze, and produced implements and weapons of a large variety of forms. Their most noteworthy weapon was a long two-edged cutting sword, and among their ornaments was the violin-bow fibula, which probably points to a loose garment caught up at the shoulder.

Numerous cemeteries give us an idea of the mode in which the *terremare*-folk disposed of their dead. The bodies were invariably burned and the ashes placed in a pottery urn, occasionally with an object or two of metal, possibly nothing more than the ornaments worn on the person. The urn was then covered with an inverted bowl, also of pottery, and the whole was ready for burial. The *terramara* of Castellazzo had close beside it a small pile-built cemetery on which the urns were placed, but more frequently they were merely laid in tightly-packed rows in the earth.

We thus conclude that the Bronze Age in north Italy was marked by the immigration into the Po valley of a new people, another branch of which had perhaps entered Italy even earlier, in the Copper Age, to found the earlier pile-dwellings of the Italian lakes. We do not know from direct evidence what was the skull-form of these men, for they cremated their dead, but it is tempting to regard them as a branch of the great Aryan-speaking people whose movements were then convulsing central Europe. If this be sound we must picture the *terremare*-folk as a broad-headed people, speaking an Indo-European language from which Latin and the various Italic dialects afterwards sprang.

While these events were happening in north Italy the centre of the peninsula was developing much more slowly. The material at our disposal from this area is singularly small, but it suffices to show that except for the gradual introduction of bronze implements of forms familiar to us from the *terremare* little change was taking place. The same is also true of those parts of north Italy

where the invaders had not established themselves, and indeed we may say in general that Italy, apart from the districts held by the northern immigrants, possessed in the Bronze Age a civilization which was merely the natural development of that which she had enjoyed in the Neolithic and Copper Ages. The population still lived in huts partly hollowed in the earth, more rarely in caverns, and continued to inhume its dead. There is, however, one exception to this. At Taranto has been discovered a pile-structure so similar to a *terramara* in general appearance and contents that one is tempted to suppose it due to a body of *terremare*-folk moving down from the Po valley to seek a new home in the south. This may be correct, especially as it is supported by the existence of a cremation cemetery of only slightly later date at Timmari, not very far from Taranto. At the same time the pottery of the Taranto *terramara* displays features which differentiate it from that of the *terremare* proper, despite a very distinct resemblance, and link it up with that of certain other settlements in south Italy, notably those of Coppa Nevigata on the Adriatic coast.

Such is the history of the Bronze Age on the mainland. In Sicily, however, its course was very different. We have seen that in the Copper Age Sicily had already come strongly under the influence of the higher civilization of the Mediterranean. In the Bronze Age this influence naturally increased ten-fold. Consequently we find that the pottery and bronzes of the island are totally unlike those of north Italy. The painted ware of the Copper Age now gradually disappears, and its place is taken either by red polished pottery or by a dull grey ware with tasteful designs incised upon it. But along with these native products are found, especially in the cemeteries nearest the coast, vases of well-known Mycenaean (Late Minoan III) types, Mycenaean rapiers, a bronze mirror, and beads of glass paste. These prove beyond all doubt that Sicily was now enjoying commerce with one at least of the great centres of Aegean trade subsequent to the overthrow of the Cretan power. The prosperity enjoyed by the south-eastern portion of the island at this time was very considerable. The tombs of the period are imposing rock-sepulchres, often consisting of several chambers, which contain, not as in the earlier period large quantities of bodies, but usually no more than three or four, placed round a kind of funerary banquet which is arranged in the centre of the tomb. Nothing could be more striking than the contrast between such a rock-tomb as this, with its unburnt bodies and its Aegean imports, and a *terramara*

cemetery with its cremation urns containing little more than charred bones.

Towards the end of the Bronze Age events of the first importance took place on the mainland of Italy. The *terremare*-folk, whose numbers had increased beyond the capacity of the area to which they had at first confined themselves, began to spread southward over the Apennines into Tuscany and Latium, where they founded for themselves new homes, no longer in pile-dwellings, but in ordinary hut-villages. Some of them, however, continued to inhabit the Po valley, though not always in *terremare*, and founded the civilization of the early Iron Age to which the name Villanovan has been given¹. Strictly speaking, this term should be used only for that particular type of the early Iron Age civilization which we find in this area, with Bologna for its centre. In practice, however, it is frequently applied to the very similar branches of this civilization which we find in other parts of north and central Italy.

The transition between the *terremare*-period proper and the early Iron Age (Villanova) is not at present fully represented in Bologna itself, though quite lately a cemetery has been discovered outside Porta San Vitale, which takes us back farther than anything hitherto found there. Two other sites in north Italy, namely Bismantova and Fontanella Mantovana (not to be confused with the chalcolithic cemetery mentioned on p. 566), have revealed cemeteries which, while definitely more recent than the latest *terremare*-cemeteries (they contain, for instance, a very primitive form of the arched bow fibula, which does not occur in the *terremare* or their cemeteries), are equally definitely earlier than the oldest Villanova tombs, those known as type Benacci I. In Latium a similar place is filled by the earliest tombs of Tolfa and Allumiere and of Veii, in the Marche by those of Pianello, near Genga. In Umbria, too, the earliest of the Iron Age tombs are still transitional, while in the south of the peninsula we have the cemetery of Timmari, referred to above.

The date of this great southward movement of *terremare*-folk cannot be fixed. It is undoubtedly later than the fall of the Cretan power in the Mediterranean. On the other hand, the general lines

¹ It is necessary to point out that this view is not universally accepted. Grenier, for instance, believes that the Villanova civilization originated in Tuscany and was then carried across the Apennines to the Po valley. Brizio, who attributed the *terremare* to the neolithic Ibero-Liguri, despite the burial rite of cremation, brought in a new people, the Umbri, over the Alps at the end of the Bronze Age to found the Villanova civilization.

of the early Iron Age civilization in Italy were definitely laid down before the first vases of the Greek Geometric style began to reach the shores of Campania and Tuscany, and any attempt to explain the early Iron Age of Italy as a mere product of Greek influence is simply a refusal to meet the facts.

There is nothing more striking in connection with this period in Italy than the local variation exhibited by the different parts of the country. The early Iron Age civilization may be divided locally into no fewer than nine distinct groups:—(1) Golasecca group. This occupies the country south of Lakes Maggiore and Como, and is a development of the Copper and Bronze Age civilization of the pile-dwellers in these lakes. (2) Atestine group. This occupies most of the Veneto. It is a very clearly-defined group, partly, perhaps, due to development from the *terremare* civilization, partly, in the opinion of some, to an immigration of new people (Illyrians) from outside Italy. (3) The Villanova group, clearly a development of the *terremare* culture. (4) The Tuscan group, occupying most of Tuscany. (5) The Latian group, occupying part of Latium and thickly spread around Rome and the Alban Hills. These five groups agree in that in each the earliest burials are cremations. (6) Novilara group, occupying the valleys of the Adriatic coast. (7) The Campanian group. (8) The South Italian group, which is a collection of sporadic and not altogether homogeneous cemeteries rather than a clearly-defined group. (9) The Sicilian group.

The Sicilian group, as might have been expected, stands very much by itself, and is a natural development of the Sicilian Bronze Age civilization under Aegean and other influences. Groups 6, 7 and 8 consist of cemeteries where cremation is totally absent, and are undoubtedly due to descendants of the original neolithic inhabitants of the peninsula, who seem to have been scarcely affected by the movements taking place around them or by civilizing influence from abroad. In connection with the South Italian group, it must be noticed that it possesses one exception to the rule of inhumation in the necropolis of Timmari. This is clearly to be brought into connection with the *terramara* at Taranto, than which it is not much later. But as this raid of *terremare*-folk into the south was not followed by the same development as in Tuscany and Latium, so far as our evidence at present goes, we must infer that the number of the immigrants was too small to leave a permanent mark on the district.

Of the first five groups, whose practice of cremation and whose civilization generally indicate that they are to be ascribed to the

terremare-people in the first instance, three assume special importance in the light of subsequent history, namely, those of Villanova proper, Tuscany and Latium. In the Villanova group four periods can be clearly traced, named respectively Benacci I, Benacci II, Arnoaldi and Certosa. The first three of these periods are purely Italian in character, though the civilization displayed is not without affinities to that of Hallstatt. At the same time, it is to be noted that the necropolis of Hallstatt itself contains no tombs of so primitive a character as the transition cemeteries of Bismantova and Fontanella, or even the earliest graves of Benacci I. The Certosa group, dating from the end of the sixth century B.C. onward, is strongly Etruscan in character, and there is every reason for supposing that at this date the Etruscans spread from Tuscany northwards into the Po valley. On the other hand, there is not a shred of archaeological evidence for placing this movement at an earlier date.

The main interest of the Tuscan group lies in the fact that on the soil of Tuscany first appears in Italy that civilization which we are wont to call Etruscan. It is not possible or advisable here to discuss the origin of this extraordinary people; suffice it to say that up to the present little progress has been made towards a solution of the problem. One thing, however, must be made quite clear. Although both language and tradition point to the Etruscans as immigrants from a distance, yet archaeology can find in the early Iron Age civilization of Tuscany no sudden break in continuity such as might have been expected to occur at the moment of their arrival. On the contrary, the Iron Age culture of Tuscany develops smoothly without a break from the start, and many features usually put down as Etruscan are purely native, and are to be found in the parallel groups of Villanova proper and Latium. Thus the pottery known as *bucchero*, commonly associated with the Etruscans, is nothing more than a fine development of a ware which had been made in Tuscany throughout the Iron Age, and probably had its origin in the slightly-polished black ware of the *terremare*. The inference drawn by some from this continuity is that the Etruscans were simply an Italian folk who, under Greek and other influence, surpassed their immediate neighbours in culture. Others consider that the evidence of language, tradition, art, clothing and architecture forbids such a conclusion; and that the Etruscans were invaders who, however, came in numbers insufficient to revolutionize the general civilization of Tuscany, forming probably a conquering upper class to whom the rich tombs of Corneto and similar sites

are to be attributed. Their place of origin cannot at present be fixed. The alleged affinities of the language with Lydian are generally supposed to point to an origin somewhere in or near Asia Minor, which is perhaps supported by the oriental character of Etruscan art, not to mention the tradition recorded by Herodotus. The old suggestion that the Etruscans came over the Alps from Rhaetia is ruled out by the late appearance of their products in the Bologna area and the Po valley generally. See p. 115q.

An Iron Age group which to the modern world is of still higher interest than the Tuscan is the Latian, for in this area we must seek for the data which bear on the origin of the Roman people. In various parts of Latium, and more particularly in the Roman Forum itself, we have a series of graves which stretches from the confines of the Bronze Age down to the end of the seventh century B.C., a series the latter part of which can be approximately dated by the imported Greek pottery, beginning with sub-Mycenaean, coming down through Geometric and Proto-Corinthian to full Corinthian. In the earliest tombs of the Forum the burial rite is found to be in some cases inhumation and in others cremation. Cremation, however, steadily gives way before inhumation, and in the later cemeteries the second rite is universal. The interpretation given to these facts by most archaeologists is as follows. The early cremation graves are due to the *terremare*-folk who moved from the Po valley into Tuscany and Latium at the end of the Bronze Age. The inhumations are due to the old neolithic inhabitants of the area. As time went on the two elements became more mixed and the burial rite of inhumation prevailed almost completely. In these two races we must see the origin of the mixed Roman people of historic times, though it is far from certain that in the diversity of race we should recognize the origin of the sharp distinctions between patricians and plebeians. It is tempting at first sight to identify the patricians with the invading and conquering *terremare*-folk and the plebeians with the conquered neolithic people of Latium, the Ibero-Liguri. Yet difficulties at once arise for, though we find both inhumation and cremation in historical Rome, and though at the end of the Republic it would seem that inhumation was much more frequent among the poorer classes than among the rich, yet there are many circumstances which indicate that the difference between patricians and plebeians was not an ethnical one.

INDEX TO NAMES

a = circle. d = dolmen. f = fissure or cave. m = megalithic remains. mw = menhir. s = sanctuary, temple.

B = bronze age remains. C = chalcolithic. I = iron.
N = neolithic. P = palaeolithic.

AA = patches in Sardinia without nuraghe.

mb = menhir of the Bar district

Alban Hills, D 4
Alghero, B 4
Alumiere, C 3
Atri, D 3
Auhdena, E 4

Barietta, F 4
Bastia, B 3
Belmonte Piceno, D 3
Buscoglie, F 4
Bisenzio, C 3
Bismantova, C 2
Bologna, C 2

Capri, E 4
Capua, E 4
Castellazzo, B 2
Castelluccio, F 2
Castenotolo, C 2
Cervetti, D 4
Chusi, C 3
Castellum, F 4
Como, B 2
S. Cono di Lodi, F 2
Coppa Navigata, F 4
Corneto, C 3
Correchio, C 2
Corse, C, B 3
Corsica, B 3, 4
Cumae, E 4

Fabriano, D 3
Faleri, D 3
Fermo, D 3
Florence, C 3
Fontanella, C 2

Gardia, L., C 2
Gargano, Mt., F 4
Golasecca, B 4
Gorizia, D 2

Imerse, F 2

Lecco, G 4
Locri, F 5
Lombardy, C 2

Marsiliana, C 3
Matera, F 4
Matrensa, F 2

Megara Hyblaea, F 2
Moada, E 2
Molfetta, F 4
Monti Lessini, C 2

Nidastore, D 3
Novilara, D 3
Numana, D 3
Olmo, C 3
Orvieto, D 3


Palermo, E 2
Pantufica, F 2
Pianello, D 3
Pulchra, B 3
Predmont, B 2
Pitigliano, C 3
Po, R., B 2, D 2
Ponte Lecca, B 3
Pyulonia, C 3
Tianeste, D 4

Renedello, C 2
Rimini, D 2
Rumanelli, G 4, 5
Rome, D 3

S. Lucia, D 1
Sardina, B 4
Sartene, B 4
Sicily, EF 2
Stentinello, F 2
Suessula, E 4

Taranto, F 4
Termini, F 2
Timmar, F 4
Tolentino, D 3
Tolla, C 3
Torre di Scaia, F 5
Tuscany, C 3

Umbia, D 3
Valle della Vibrata, D 3
Vai, D 3
Venza, E 4
Vetralla, D 3
Vetulonia, C 3
Vulci, C 3



II. THE MALTESE ISLANDS AND NORTH AFRICA

The history of the Maltese islands in prehistoric times begins with the recent discovery, in the cave of Ghar Dalam, of remains attributed, with considerable probability, to Neanderthal man. Two human teeth were also found in the Tal-Herba fissure, but presented no special characteristics. The remains in the cave were in association with flints and with the remains of animals of the quaternary or pleistocene period, including an extinct species of elephant and two species of stag. *Elephas mnaidrensis* was found in the same layer; while in deeper and earlier layers remains of this and two other small elephants (*Melitensis* and *Falconerii*) all peculiar to the island, and two species of hippopotamus (*Penislandi* and *minor*). Remains of swans (*Cygnus Falconerii*) and land tortoises have also been found in Malta. This fauna cannot have lived on the island as it now is, and can only have inhabited it when it formed part of a larger continent, connecting Italy with Africa, and dividing what later became the Mediterranean into two distinct freshwater basins. We may note further (1) that remains of similar fauna have been found in Sicily; (2) that remains of Neanderthal man have been found at Gibraltar, no doubt dating from the time when the Straits were not yet open; but (3) that analogous discoveries are hitherto entirely lacking on the north African coast.

From the stratification of the cave, the upper layers of which contain pottery of the Bronze Age, it is clear that, while the bridge between Europe and Africa of which it formed a part must have ceased to exist during the palaeolithic period, possibly owing to an earthquake, the island itself was never submerged, as some authorities have believed; while the fact that thigh-bones predominate among the remains of the hippopotamus may go to prove that these animals had been used for food.

When the break of continuity occurred we do not know, but it is hardly probable that it should be placed as late as the close of the neolithic age¹, while, on the other hand, it is still less possible to attribute it to the beginning of the quaternary period. In any case, it must have been gradual in order to give time for three species of elephant not found elsewhere to develop.

¹ Sir Gerald Strickland, *Malta and the Phoenicians*, Malta, 1920, p. 8, maintains this view, alluding to the 'cart-ruts' which break off suddenly at the edge of the cliffs. For these see *Man*, 1918, Nos. 40, 52, 69, 93, where they are assigned to the neolithic period, or even to Roman date; while Prof. Boyd Dawkins dismisses them as natural fissures. Neither of these last two suppositions is acceptable.

To the neolithic period—long after the Maltese group of islands had assumed its present form—belongs a group of megalithic remains of great interest. There are a number of simple menhirs and dolmens (unluckily all ransacked long ago); and there are also several large and important sanctuaries, of a type quite peculiar to the island. The typical plan is formed of two elliptical spaces with an apse at each end, placed side by side; the main façade of the building is curved, with a forecourt in front. The main axis of the building lies across the narrower diameters of the ellipses, and on its line, opposite the entrance, is placed a niche. The whole construction is of very large orthostatic slabs, surmounted by ashlar masonry (note the parallelism with Sardinia, etc., pp. 582, 599); and the apses were roofed by the projection of each course above the one below. Whether, and if so, how, the central spaces were roofed is uncertain. The apses are often shut off by stone screens, with window-like openings in them: and there are numerous niches containing trilithons, each formed by a horizontal slab of stone supported at its ends by two vertical slabs, and often by a single pillar in the centre as well. Such pillars, as well as stone tables, have also been found standing free; and they have been taken as signs of a baetylic worship. But the idea that the cult was a cult of the dead, and that the cells were the actual burial-places of the deified heroes, has been disproved by the excavations at Hal-Tarxien, where some of the niches were found to be full of the bones of sacrificial animals. In one case an altar stone (?) in front of a niche was found to be hollow, and filled with fragments of bones of ox, sheep, etc., together with pottery and flint implements. The stone was decorated with spirals, and carefully closed with a plug. We may notice, on the other hand, the discovery in these buildings, not merely of steatopygous statuettes, but of actual reliefs (at Hagiär-Kim, much weathered), and statues (at Hal-Tarxien, a female figure, originally some seven feet high). There is no doubt, in any case, that oracular responses were given in these buildings. In the oldest portion of the sanctuary at Hal-Tarxien there is a little hole in the side-wall of one of the apses, communicating with a small chamber which was accessible from what was probably the dwellings of the priests: and a similar arrangement exists both at Mnajdra and at Hagiär-Kim.

No decoration is found in the earliest portion of Hal-Tarxien, in which three periods have been distinguished. In the second portion we find some very fine spiral decoration, which has, however, probably been added during the third period, in which

it is very abundant, and of great beauty and variety. (We may, however, safely attribute the relief of bulls and a sow to the second period.) Such decoration is less plentiful in the other sanctuaries. In all of them we find some of the upright stones flanking entrances and niches pitmarked, either by percussion or by turning a stick round and round. There are also a number of minor buildings, which are of similar construction, to which a residential use must probably, in part at least, be attributed (Corradino and Id Deb-Dieba may be mentioned), while a number still await excavation¹.

The hypogeum of Hal-Safleeni is unique. It was approached from above ground by a megalithic structure, which has unfortunately been almost entirely destroyed, and consists of a complex of subterranean chambers following no definite plan. The largest is circular and is a copy in the solid rock of a megalithic structure above ground, even the monolithic sideposts and lintels of the doors and niches being represented in high relief. Below this circular chamber a staircase descends to a lower storey, which contains a number of chambers, some of them deep pits. Their purpose is quite uncertain; but it has been noticed that the acoustics of the hypogeum were arranged so that fictitious oracular responses could easily be given here, as in the other temples; and it may not be too fanciful to suppose that mysterious and cruel rites were carried on.

Two of the larger rooms still have decorations of curved lines and spirals in red paint, and these originally extended over a considerable part of the hypogeum. Others, on the other hand, were very small and low, and their entrances are merely windows.

The original purpose of this hypogeum is unknown; but before the close of the neolithic period it came into use as an ossuary. The remains of thousands of human skeletons were found, for the most part in disorder (one body in a crouching position), and with the bones were found pottery (one fine bowl showing a series of the long-horned *Bubalus antiquus*, a species which existed, in the late neolithic period, on the northern coasts of Africa) and numerous small objects, including many model stone celts, which must have served as amulets.

While the modern Maltese are essentially the same as the inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean, ten skulls proved to belong to the dolichocephalic 'Mediterranean' type; and thirty-

¹ Schuchhardt (*Berlin. S. B.* 1914, p. 277) is wrong in maintaining that all the large megalithic buildings were dwellings in which some form of worship was at the same time carried on.

five burials of the same period were found in the cave of Burmeghez. One isolated neolithic burial showed the crouching position, and the use of red pigment (an iron ochre). The rock-tombs in the Bingemma Hills, so often referred to as prehistoric, are of Punic date.


Round stone huts of ancient date have so far not been found in Malta, but those in use at the present day are similar in type to the ancient examples of Sardinia and the west of Ireland.

In all the buildings described above pottery has been found in very great abundance, and numerous small implements in flint or chert, but never a trace of metal. The pottery presents a great variety of types, and much of it is of extreme fineness and beauty. Attempts to establish the course of its development have hitherto failed; and the resemblances which have been noticed between it and the chalcolithic wares of the rest of the Mediterranean are more apparent than real. For this reason the attempts at dating the megalithic buildings of Malta in which the spiral is made to play a prominent part have so far not been successful¹.

No remains of the Copper and Bronze Ages had been known in Malta until Zammit discovered a Bronze Age cremation cemetery, which had been established within the Hal-Tarxien Sanctuary after it had fallen into disuse. The pottery is deeply incised before firing, and the incisions are filled with white. Pottery of the same period has been found in the upper layers of Ghar Dalam; and it is possible that the Bahria ware may have to be referred to the same period, though the two fabrics have not as yet been found together. As in Sicily, there is no evidence for any Phoenician settlement in the island prior to the foundation of Carthage: and, as at Motya, the earliest Punic objects found in the island are associated with proto-Corinthian pottery. The old view that the megalithic monuments of the island are due to the Phoenicians has been entirely given up.

North Africa from a geographical point of view belongs to the western Mediterranean rather than to the continent of Africa; and, while the breaking through of the Straits of Gibraltar is attributable to the Pliocene period, there was actual connection with Italy even in the Pleistocene Age. It is clear that the process of disconnection must have been slow (p. 575); but after it had taken place, the rarity of natural harbours and the difficulty of reaching the interior may account for the comparative isolation of north Africa until Roman days, though there is no evidence

¹ Schuchhardt puts them at about 2000 B.C., Evans at 2500-2000 B.C. (*Proc. Soc. Ant.* 1915-16, p. 251); cf. vol. 4, pp. 78, 97.



a = circle, d = dolmen, f = fissure or cave, m = megalithic remains, mn = menhir, s = sanctuary, temple.
 B = bronze age remains, C = chalcolithic, I = iron, N = neolithic, P = palaeolithic.

that the climate differed to any great extent from that of the present day.

There are abundant traces (some rock-shelters, but more often settlements in the open near water-points, recognizable from the huge heaps of snail shells mixed with ashes) in north Africa of a later palaeolithic culture, hitherto believed to be independent of the European, which has been called Capsian from the name of the locality (Capsa, the modern Gafsa, in southern Tunisia) where such flints were first found, and seems to fill in the whole interval between it and the neolithic period. Its geographical extent is very wide. It is found in the centre of the Sahara, in the provinces of Constantine and Oran, and not far from Ghadames on the frontier of Tripolitania. It belongs, indeed, according to some, to the Mediterranean area of the upper palaeolithic culture¹, an area which included the Phoenician coasts, north Africa, the Italian and Spanish peninsulas (excluding from the latter Cantabria and the Pyrenees) and the greater part of Provence. Others, however, do not admit the existence of a distinct Capsian or Gaetulian culture². For them the Acheulean culture was followed as in Europe by the Mousterian, which in the Sahara 'seems to have lasted till neolithic times, whereas farther north in Africa that of Aurignac (the so-called Capsian) had a wide extension and eventually influenced Europe. Specimens of Solutrean type seem to be derived direct from St Acheul forms, without the intermediate Mousterian or Aurignac stages, and have not hitherto been acknowledged in the Sahara.' The tanged implements hitherto considered neolithic have also been proved to be of earlier date. A number of caves and open-air stations yielding traces of neolithic culture, including very rough pottery, have been discovered in Algeria; and the palaeolithic culture of the Sahara did not die out in the neolithic period. North and central Tunisia, on the other hand, are poor in prehistoric remains, and this poverty continues into the Bronze Age. Whether this is due to imperfect exploration or not is uncertain. It is probable that the sheep and goat were introduced into Barbary from the east in the early neolithic period, and the horse and dog between 1500 and 1000 B.C. We are on surer ground in identifying the Libyan Ammon, represented in rock-engravings of south-western Algeria,

¹ So Abbé Breuil, *Proc. of the XIVth International Congress, Geneva, 1912*; Sergi, *Italia*, pp. 206 *sqq.*; cf. vol. 1, p. 36.

² MM. Reygasse and Latapie, *Revue Scientifique*, Oct. 9, 1920, summarised in *Antiquaries' Journal*, 1 (1921), 143; cf. also Burkitt, *Prehistory*, p. 94.

as a ram, with a solar disk behind the head¹, with the Theban Amon-Re (sixteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.) and in noting that the Libyan warriors, who were a terror to the Egyptians even in the XIth and XIIth Dynasties, are represented, in the fourteenth century B.C., with white skins, blue eyes, and fair beards, tattooed with the symbol of Neit, the goddess of Sais. It should be noticed that a considerable proportion of blonde individuals is still to be found among the Berber races; this is an original type, not due to later admixture.

We know far less of the Bronze Age in north Africa than of the periods which preceded it². No definitely Bronze Age stations nor cemeteries, and hardly any objects have as yet come to light. Megalithic monuments (mostly small) are very abundant throughout the whole area: and in Algeria there are some very extensive dolmenic cemeteries, while near Ellez in Tunisia we may note a corridor tomb (*allée couverte*) in which three dolmen-like chambers lie on each side of a passage, and a seventh at the end opposite to the entrance: the whole is surrounded by a circle formed like the rest of orthostatic slabs. The cylindrical tombs known as *chouchers* (cf. p. 583) present certain analogies with other megalithic monuments of the Mediterranean³. But while the types of these monuments may go back to a remote antiquity, as they stand (as far as we can date them), they are all comparatively recent (certainly not earlier than 1000 B.C., *i.e.* the Iron Age), and for some as yet unexplained reason the type survived even after the Christian era.

As to the physical characteristics of the people, it has been maintained that there has been very little change in the Berbers in 3000 years, and that they represented the dolichocephalous *Homo eurafricanus* or 'Mediterranean' race, the population having been very little affected by subsequent invasions. Similarly, Burkitt asserts: 'This (the Cro-Magnon) race probably came over from north Africa, the early Aurignacian industry in France being seemingly derived from the Capsian culture of Africa.' Farther south, on the edge of the Sahara, on the other hand,

¹ The date of these rock-engravings is difficult to fix: many of them are undoubtedly not prehistoric. Vassel (*Rev. A.* 5th series, XIII, 1921, pp. 79 sqq.) maintains that the source of the type, which is of totemistic nature, should be sought in Libya rather than in Egypt.

² Resemblances between the chalcolithic pottery of the Mediterranean basin and the modern Berber pottery must be used with great caution.

³ A *nuraghe*-like building seen by Rohlf at Ghadames, on the Tripolitania-Tunisian frontier deserves further study. Pais in *Arch. Stor. Sardo.* VI (1910), p. 101, n. 3.

ancient authors place the Ethiopians, a race burnt black by the sun: and skeletons of negroid type have been discovered in 'Gaetulian' stations in south-western Tunisia and near Tébéssa. Their exact relations with other peoples of the African continent cannot yet be fixed. We find Herodotus dividing the Libyans into two great groups, divided from one another by Lake Tritonis (perhaps the Lesser Syrtis or the Shatts), the eastern group being nomads, the western agriculturists. Of the numerous tribal names which he gives none can be certainly identified with any Egyptian or modern name¹.

The earliest Phoenician colony in north Africa was Utica, founded, according to tradition, about 1100 B.C.; and Hadrumetum, Hippo (whether Diarrhytus or Regius, we do not know), Leptis Magna and Lixus (on the north coast of Morocco) can, if we are to believe ancient writers, also claim considerable antiquity. All these colonies are, rightly or wrongly, attributed to Tyre. Carthage, on the other hand, was founded at the end of the ninth century B.C., and there are no arguments for the existence of any earlier city on the site. And it may be observed that there is no archaeological evidence for the Phoenicians anywhere in the lands of the western Mediterranean before the middle of the eighth century B.C.

III. SARDINIA, CORSICA AND THE BALEARIC ISLANDS

Of the smaller islands off the north coast of Africa the volcanic island of Pantelleria contains remains of a village of rectangular megalithic huts defended by a wall, and of circular or elliptical tombs, mostly in the form of truncated cones of large stones, known as *sesi*, each containing a circular chamber, entered by a low door, and having a corbelled roof. The largest has twelve such chambers, and rises in ridges to a dome at the top. These remains belong entirely to the neolithic period: and the obsidian of Pantelleria was largely exported to Sicily. Mackenzie (*Memnon*, II, 202) remarks: 'The fact that the rounded type of building should apparently be exclusively arrogated to sepulchral use in Pantelleria alongside of dwellings of rectangular shape while in Sardinia the case is reversed is a strong argument for the early

¹ Gsell, *l'Afrique du Nord*, I, 354, does not accept the identification of the Meshwesh who tried to invade Egypt under Merneptah and Ramses III (p. 166), with the *Máφες* of Herodotus who dwelt in the modern Tunisia, and, like the Libyans of the Egyptian monuments, let their hair grow only on the right of the head. He regards Diodorus's account of the Libyan Amazons as a mere romance.

co-existence of both types of building under varying local circumstances.'

The island of Lampedusa, which, like Pantelleria, now belongs to Italy, has remains of numerous megalithic hut foundations, which are oval, and built of orthostatic blocks, with coursed masonry above them.

Unlike Sicily, Sardinia has so far produced no evidence of its occupation in the palaeolithic period, nor even in early neolithic times. The material is indeed scanty, and so far we only have a few settlements and burial-caves. It has been supposed that Sardinia has preserved its neolithic population, belonging to the Mediterranean race, almost intact to the present day. A number of chalcolithic cemeteries have been found, of which that of Anghelu-Ruju, near Alghero, is the best known (see vol. I, p. 104). In it we recognize the cult of the nude goddess and of the symbolic axe, as at Paros and Amorgos in the Aegean; and direct Oriental influence may be admitted, though the identification with the Sardinians of the Sherden, who formed part of the Peoples of the Sea who invaded Egypt in the reigns of Merneptah and Ramses III, though accepted by many Italian writers, seems very doubtful (see p. 282).

Sardinia seems to have been at her zenith in the Bronze Age, within which the megalithic period falls. Recent investigations have shown that menhirs, *alignements* and dolmens (on these terms see p. 592) are not lacking, and indeed Mackenzie has traced the progressive development from the simple dolmen to the 'tomb of the giants,' a type of family grave which consists of a long rectangular chamber of upright slabs, sometimes surmounted by other slabs, sometimes roofed by corbelled masonry, in which the bodies were placed in a crouching position. The slab which closes the front end of the tomb is of great size, and forms the centrepiece in a curved façade of upright slabs, a feature which, with the combination of these slabs with ashlar masonry, is also seen in the Temples of Malta, in the tomb of Los Millares in Spain, and in various tombs, cairns and barrows in the British Isles. The exterior of the chamber is covered with a coating of masonry, and must have resembled an inverted boat (compare the Navetas of the Balearic islands). Another style of tomb, resembling the Sicilian type, is the rock-cut 'domus de gianas' (house of the fairies) in which the façades of the 'tombs of the giants' are sometimes imitated: while a case of combination of dolmen and rock-cut tomb shows that in Sardinia all these varieties are due to the same race.

The most important and most numerous monuments of this period are the *nuraghi*, once believed to be tombs, but now recognized to be fortified dwellings, of which it is estimated that there are about 4000 in the island. They are circular tower-like structures in the form of a truncated cone, built of large stones in comparatively regular courses. The internal chamber is circular, with two or three lateral niches, and a corbelled roof; and sometimes there are two or three stories, the upper chambers being approached by a winding stair. To this are often added elaborate fortifications consisting of walls, towers and bastions; and the *nuraghi* are so placed as to occupy the best strategic positions available, being all directly or indirectly in signalling communication with each other. The larger *nuraghi* were the centres of groups of circular stone huts. Their origin is probably the circular stone hut once roofed with brushwood, examples of which have been found in many places. There are, however, various analogies with the *tholoi* of the Aegean. It is noticeable that the later rectangular types of habitation did not find their way into Sardinia.

Several circular temples of this period, each erected over a sacred well, have recently come to light. In two cases there was unmistakable evidence of the worship of a deity in the form of a bull¹, and the worship of sacred pillars was widespread. There is also evidence for ordeals by water, and the practice of incubation, all of which may be held to show eastern influence. We have distinct evidence of the importation of copper from the Aegean (probably Cyprus) in the famous ingots of Serra Ilixi.

Timaeus tells us that the island was first inhabited by the Iberians, then by the Heraclidae, then by the Carthaginians, while other authors give varying accounts. Attempts have been made to prove linguistically the parallelism of Sardinian with Ibero-Ligurian names of north Africa and Spain; and this may well be accepted as probable. On the other hand, vague comparisons between the *nuraghi* and the megalithic cylindrical tombs (*chouchets*) of north Africa are useless, inasmuch as the latter are very late; and a connection between Sardinia and Libya is not proved before Phoenician times, to which the legend of the occupation of the island by Libyans under Sardus, a son of Hercules, may be attributed. Nor can the Ilienses (Ἰόλαιοι), who dwelt in the mountains of Sardinia in Punic times, be certainly identified with any other race.

¹ Taramelli in *Mon. Lincei*, xxiii, 353; xxv, 55 sqq. (large bulls' heads in stone, probably from the façade).

Corsica contains important megalithic remains, consisting of forty-one menhirs, thirteen dolmens, two *alignements* and a cromlech, which fall into two groups, one in the extreme north and one in the extreme south-west of the island: while there are two megalithic fortified sites in the centre. It is to be noted that no remains of round huts, nor indeed of any kind of habitations corresponding to the dolmens, have so far come to light. The mounds with which the dolmens were once covered have completely disappeared, and there is no actual evidence as to the date of these megalithic monuments. Sardinian obsidian has, however, been found in Corsica, and Corsican serpentine and quartz in Sardinia, showing that in the chalcolithic period there was intercourse between the two; and it is probable that these monuments belong to that age. Bronze Age burials have also been found near Cap Corse, at the north end of the island.

The Stone Age is scantily, if at all, represented in the Balearic islands: while to the Bronze Age and to the Minoan civilization belong the numerous megalithic monuments of the islands, the *talayots*, which are circular or rectangular towers, not unlike the *nuraghi* of Sardinia, and, like them, were probably fortified dwellings. Their number is unknown in Majorca: 195 have been counted in Minorca. Some writers suppose them to have been merely stone huts for agricultural purposes, such as are still constructed at the present day. Besides these there are the *naus* or *navetas*, so called from their resemblance to an inverted boat, which are still more closely allied to the 'tombs of the giants,' and appear to have served the same object. Rock-cut tombs are also found: and prehistoric villages surrounded by large stone walls, the houses in which are of two types, built either above ground or below; the first are square or rectangular with rounded corners, the base course occasionally consisting of orthostatic slabs. The subterranean dwellings are faced with stone and roofed with flat slabs supported by columns. A few specimens of huge trilithons (a horizontal slab mortised into a vertical support) are also known: they are not found isolated, but always within ruins which are possibly those of sanctuaries.

The *ex-votos* of Costig (Majorca), the most important of which are three large heads of oxen, several horns, and a number of gems, some of which represent bulls or cows, together with the leaden plaques with horns of consecration found at Pina in Majorca, and in the Talayot des Lluc Major in Minorca, are now known to belong to the Roman period.

IV. THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

From its very geographical position as one of the bridges connecting Europe with Africa and as guardian of the outlet of the Mediterranean, the expectation that the Iberian peninsula should have played an important rôle in the early history of western Europe would be only natural and, as the archaeological discoveries of the last thirty years have shown, this expectation has been abundantly fulfilled. More especially does this hold good for the earliest stages of man's proved existence in the peninsula. His presence there in palaeolithic times has been demonstrated in the amplest measure, even though as yet the evidence for the earliest periods, as known from other parts of Europe, is comparatively scanty. Chellean implements have been found, however, in the central regions (as at San Isidro, Madrid, Torralba, Soria, and Puente Mocho, Jaen), in the extreme south (Laguna de la Janda, Cadiz), and in the west around Lisbon; the absence of evidence for the north is regarded as purely accidental. Examples of Acheulean deposits occur in the Cueva de Castillo, Santander, at San Isidro, and to the north of Coimbra; the first-named site has also furnished evidence of Mousterian culture. Numerous traces of Mousterian man have also come to light in southern and eastern Spain; cf. vol. i, p. 94.

Thus far the evidence shows a palaeolithic civilization parallel to that of France and distributed throughout the peninsula. This diffusion coupled with the absence of Chellean deposits in central Europe has been interpreted as proof that the three early waves of palaeolithic culture spread northwards from Africa, where they are all well represented. With the passing of the Mousterian epoch, a break occurs in the uniformity of the civilization of the peninsula with that of more northerly Europe. In the extreme north Cantabria constitutes part of a Franco-Cantabrian province, to which belong the series of rock-paintings exemplified in Spain by those of the caves of Altamira, Castillo, La Pasiega and numerous others, accompanied by typical Aurignacian and Solutrean remains, as at Castillo and Cueto de Mina, and yet more frequent products of Magdalenian art, such as *bâtons de commandement* and other objects carved and engraved in the style of the period, but in no wise so richly representative as those of southern France.

Meanwhile, the rest of the peninsula falls under the sway of a new culture, the so-called Capsian, originating from northern Africa, where it is found immediately succeeding the Mousterian,

but at the same time containing an admixture of Aurignacian types. It is particularly well represented in southern and eastern Spain, for example in Murcia where cave-deposits have produced Mousterian followed by Capsian elements. It is to this Capsian culture that belong the numerous paintings on rock-shelters, which, occurring in numerous sites in the eastern provinces (Alpera, Albacete, etc.), extend to the north (Cogul, Lerida). These paintings differ from the Cantabrian group of isolated animal figures in their composite scenes of battles, the chase, and particularly in the constant portrayal of the human form, sometimes in scenes which seem to have a ceremonial significance. There is, moreover, an absence of the older quaternary fauna, such as the mammoth and the reindeer, whose continued existence farther north is attested by the French finds. The northerly extension of the Capsian civilization with its flint implements of geometric forms and microlithic character through the eastern Pyrenees thrust aside to either hand the Azilian, the last child of the northern Palaeolithic, and laid the foundations of the neolithic Tardenoisian culture.

It is thus to the Iberian peninsula that western Europe owed the impulses which mark the gradual evolution (not, as formerly believed, a brusque transition) from palaeolithic to neolithic times. In spite of the many proofs of palaeolithic man's activities in the peninsula, but few actual human remains have so far come to light. Isolated portions of skulls from Gerona and Cantabria, including two *calvaria* from Castillo transformed into cups, belong to periods ranging from the Mousterian to the Magdalenian, and fall into line with the stratigraphical evidence of the discoveries in the north. More interesting as witness to the homogeneous character and wide range of early palaeolithic civilization in Europe is the skull of Neanderthal type found in Forbes Quarry, Gibraltar, in 1848. So far, skeletal remains of Capsian man seem to be lacking, but to the resultant Azilian are assigned the discoveries at Mugem on the Tagus, where, at a point now not reached by the sea, shell-heaps akin to the northern 'kitchen-middens' were, accompanied by typical geometric flints. In addition, several burials were revealed, important, because, amidst a largely preponderating dolichocephalic type, appeared a small admixture of brachycephalic and sub-brachycephalic skulls, such as also occurred in the shell-midden of Cabeço de Arruda. Associated similarly with shell-middens there appears at the entrance of caves east of Oviedo in Asturias a localized post-palaeolithic development of flint-working with forms which hark

back to palaeolithic forms. The uppermost of three cultural layers at one site furnished sherds of very rudimentary pottery, thus at last apparently bringing us into contact with neolithic man.

The gradual transition briefly sketched above is corroborated by the rock-paintings throughout the peninsula, in which on the early naturalistic drawings are often found superimposed other drawings, more sketchy in execution. A progressive stylization through the neolithic period can be presumed from the advanced degeneration of the human form portrayed in drawings belonging to the chalcolithic age, as at Peña Tu, Asturias. Thus the Capsian culture forms the background for the subsequent pre-history of the peninsula.

Apart from the paintings, the material for the study of early neolithic man in the peninsula is of the scantiest. It may be that the period prior to the dolmens was of comparatively short duration. Something of this nature seems to be indicated by the occurrence in many Portuguese dolmens of flint arrows with transverse edge closely resembling the geometric forms of the kitchen-middens. The same period, judging from evidence in France and other parts of Europe, probably gave birth to the thin-butted, roughly-polished schist celts with oval or round section, which are also associated with the megaliths of Portugal, though in fewer numbers as compared with the type with quadrangular section, which constituted the type *par excellence* of the earlier dolmens. From the late neolithic period to the end of the early Bronze Age abundant material for study exists. During the earlier stages the cultures revealed in various parts of the peninsula can to some extent be differentiated from one another and correspond to fairly well-defined areas, but as time goes on they tend to coalesce with and modify one another, until they produce a more or less common culture for the whole peninsula. That this process of borrowing and absorption took place at a time when the country was acquiring its first knowledge of metals, shows that it is intimately bound up with the search for and exploitation of the mineral deposits, particularly copper.

The most striking cultural region is undoubtedly that of the megaliths. Primarily confined to Portugal, eventually it is found extended along a wide strip of territory across both the north and south of Spain, but is practically non-existent in the centre and entirely so across the middle of the east coast. One of the outstanding problems of Iberian pre-history is the origin of these monuments. From both a chronological and typological standpoint the widely-held theory of an oriental source is difficult of

acceptation. They appear to begin in central Portugal, where a series of dolmens beginning with simple types of horse-shoe form, succeeded by others with passages, at first short, and later of considerable length have been explored in Alemtejo. Remains of tumuli are often present, but they probably never entirely concealed the monuments. These dolmens have been found grouped round occupation sites. No precursor of this Portuguese series has been shown to exist in southern Spain, and nothing like them has been found in north Africa, where in addition there is at present a complete lack of proof of early dating. During the early chalcolithic period there is little variation in the construction of the monuments, except for a tendency to increase their size; but in the grave-furniture can be traced a progressive evolution by way of improvements in the pottery, the production of fine flint arrow-heads, lance and halberd-heads, the adoption of harder rocks than schist for celts with a corresponding diminution in size, the appearance of *callaïs* beads and finally the sporadic occurrence of small copper implements. The slate plaques engraved with geometric patterns, the most distinctive manifestation of this culture, do not occur outside the Portuguese megalithic area and mark it as a separate province.

The next stage is represented by the appearance in central Portugal of variants from the early type of monument. One has a polygonal chamber (Anta da Capella, Figueira); in the other the walls of the chamber are constructed of small masonry in beehive form (Monge and Serra das Mutelas, Cintra). In both cases appears a tendency towards concealment by sinking the monument deeper into the ground, heralding the transition to the subterranean tomb. At this point the megalith-builders begin to spread eastwards across the Guadiana and southwards into Algarve, where large subterranean tombs of both polygonal and beehive form are discovered in hill-slopes (Alcalar, Fonte Velho, Nora, etc.). Some of these, as shown by copper implements of developed types, were still in use, if not actually built, at an advanced period, though the progressive employment of small masonry in their construction suggests some lapse of time between the purely megalithic type and that in which small masonry alone is used. As the result of a further extension eastwards these megalithic tombs appear in the vicinity of Seville, near Antequera and elsewhere in the province of Granada, and finally in Almeria. These tombs belong throughout to the full Copper Age; but the grave-furniture associated with them in Spain is richer and copper is more in evidence.

In the north of Portugal the dolmens degenerate into simple polygonal cists concealed in tumuli (*mamōas*). This type extends into Galicia, where archaeological exploration has revealed the existence side by side with the polygonal type of graves similar but rectangular in form. These latter may link on to large groups of similar monuments in the Basque regions of Guipuzcoa, Álava and Aralar, and in Catalonia. Excavations have revealed a chalcolithic culture accompanied in some cases by beakers undoubtedly derived from the south. In Álava also occur larger polygonal and rectangular monuments which seem to be nearly related to the Portuguese series. On the other hand, the occurrence of rectangular dolmens at the two gates of the Pyrenees suggests the possibility of some invasion from France where the small rectangular dolmen is found in enormous numbers. Attracted by the copper deposits of Spain, inhabitants of southern France, where the metal was lacking, crossed the Pyrenees in search of it. On the eastern side in Catalonia the megaliths appear as an intrusive element in a culture which had developed slowly along lines suggesting connections with central and south-eastern Spain. The possibility of an invasion from France is on this side further borne out by the presence of long rectangular cists, such as not infrequently occur in southern France, in one case in association with beakers Spanish in form if not in fabric.

Contemporary with the early megaliths is a culture revealed by discoveries in caves and grottoes. Originally belonging to the centre it occurs later in many parts of the peninsula. Though in many respects closely parallel to the culture of the megaliths, it is associated with a distinctive class of pottery decorated with bands in relief and with finger-markings. This same central region later gave birth to the incised white-filled pottery, to which the beakers belong, exemplified by numerous finds, as at Ciempozuelos, Talavera de la Reina and on the Alcores. Reciprocating the diffusion of the megaliths eastwards this pottery appears in the later passage-dolmens and the beehive-tombs as well as in the grottoes, both natural and artificial. In these last, excavated in soft limestone formations, probably lies the germ of the beehive-tomb.

Parallel with the cultures of Portugal and central Spain is a third, found in the south-east, where villages on fortified hill-tops are connected with cemeteries, at first of rough-walled trenches, and later of slab-lined cists. The large number of metal objects associated with these last point to this as the region in which the minerals of the peninsula were first exploited. To the early

Bronze Age phase of this culture is attached the name 'El Argar,' taken from the site of the most noteworthy discoveries by the brothers Siret. It is characterized by burials in huge jars as well as in cists, by a profusion of copper, bronze and silver, and by finely-burnished but undecorated pottery of distinctive shapes. The El Argar culture gradually spread over a large part of the peninsula, and its influence is best evidenced by the displacement of the cists which represent the degeneration of the megaliths by cists of the type evolved in south-east Spain.

The later period of the Bronze Age is only known from isolated discoveries and hoards, but it seems to have developed along lines similar to those of the rest of western Europe.

Many attempts have been made to prove the existence of relations with the eastern Mediterranean in early prehistoric times. Some of these endeavours look to Egypt; but the failure of the theory of an oriental origin for the dolmens involves at once the discard of an Egyptian origin for associated objects. In the main, however, advocates of such relations confine themselves to the Aegean area. Calling attention to resemblances of many cultural phenomena in Spain to those of the second city of Troy, Crete, and other parts of the Aegean, they argue the existence of a lively intercourse in connection with the development of the Iberian mining industry reaching back into the third millennium B.C. These resemblances, however, must be regarded as fortuitous and such as occur among any series of primitive cultures, and the present writer considers it impossible to place the Aegean parallels in the same chronological sequence as those of Spain. The absence of discoveries of objects of incontrovertible oriental fabric, like the Phoenician imports of later times, weighs more heavily against than for such connections.

Isolated finds of beakers, apparently of Spanish manufacture in Sardinia, north Italy, Sicily and a fragment in Mallorca place beyond doubt some measure of trade within the western Mediterranean along routes by which amber found in eastern Spanish graves may have come; and equally amber in Portuguese dolmens, the existence of beehive tombs in France and Ireland, the diffusion of a Spanish type of halberd to Ireland and northern Europe argues for well-established connections along the Atlantic littoral.

Trade between the peninsula and its immediate neighbours is certain, but the assumption of flourishing entrepôts of oriental commerce in Spain, for example, in the Tarshish district, at a date much anterior to the foundation of Gades by the Phoenicians about 1000 B.C., rests on the weakest foundations.

No less hazardous are attempts to identify any part of the prehistoric civilization of the peninsula with either of the two tribal elements of classical times, namely the Ligures and the Iberi. The general uniformity of the civilization, in spite of strong local differences, renders superfluous the postulation of any considerable influx of peoples from Africa subsequent to Capsian times. All evidence for such invasions, based on parallelisms of tribal and place-names in the peninsula and north Africa recorded by classical writers, proves at most that the two countries were inhabited by peoples of a common stock, as already suggested by the predominantly dolichocephalic character of the skull-types found in post-palaeolithic graves both in Spain and Portugal.

V. FRANCE AND THE BRITISH ISLES

Both France and the British Isles were undoubtedly subjected at an early period to influences derived, directly or indirectly, from the higher centres of civilization in the Mediterranean, and therefore it is desirable to sketch here very briefly the course of the Stone and Bronze Ages in these countries, and then to consider how much, both separately and in conjunction, they owe to the Mediterranean.

France presents more perfectly than any other country the traditional series of the palaeolithic cultures (vol. 1, pp. 45 *seq.*), but stands almost alone in offering to the archaeologist abundant evidence of life during the periods which separate the neolithic from the palaeolithic. The Azilian and Campignian phases are now regarded by most authorities as helping to fill the lacuna which is so manifest in most other parts of Europe. In the early neolithic period which follows these we find established in France a dolichocephalic people not unlike the palaeolithic type of Cro-Magnon, inhabiting chiefly the three great river basins, that of the Seine, that of the Garonne, and that of the Rhone, Saône and Loire. Side by side with this type we find, mainly in the east of France, a brachycephalic race. These neolithic peoples were both pastoral and agricultural. They lived generally in small huts half scooped out in the ground. One of their most famous settlements, the Camp de Chassey, covers an area 744 metres long, from 110 to 205 broad, with a rampart 14 metres in height at either end.

Before the end of the neolithic period pile-dwellings had already come into use in Savoy and the Jura, in Lakes Annecy, Clairvaux and Châlain. But the most striking feature of neolithic France is constituted by the megalithic monuments. These com-

prise menhirs or single erect stones; *alignements* or rows of menhirs, cromlechs or circles of menhirs, occurring in connection with *alignements*; and lastly, dolmens with their more complicated derivatives, the corridor-tombs or *allées couvertes*. The most famous *alignements* are those of Carnac in Morbihan (Brittany), which stretch for nearly two miles, and comprise over 2500 menhirs. The menhirs, whether standing simply or in *alignements* or cromlechs, have no connection with burials. On the other hand, dolmens and *allées couvertes* are invariably tombs. Their distribution has been carefully studied. They are rare in the east and south-east of France, except in the departments of Aube and Alpes-Maritimes. They thus extend from the Mediterranean to the English Channel in a broad belt, which can be divided into two main groups, one in Brittany, and the other in south France, in the departments of Aveyron, Ardèche, Lot, Gard and Lozère. One of the most famous of the *allées couvertes*, to which reference will be made later, is situated in the island of Gavrinis, off the coast of Morbihan. It is a circular chamber six feet in height approached by a corridor 40 feet in length. The whole is covered by a mound of earth 200 feet in diameter. Many of the upright blocks of which the structure is formed are covered with engraved designs which, if the reproductions can be trusted, include the spiral (cf. below, p. 597).

The objects found in the megalithic tombs of Brittany along with the bones, which were frequently cremated, were axes of polished stone, flint implements, beads of *callais*, a rare mineral resembling turquoise, and pottery which includes the bell-shaped beaker covered from rim to base with incised or impressed ornament. These objects all belong to the late neolithic period. The megalithic tombs of the southern group yield a similar pottery, associated occasionally with objects of copper and bronze. We must suppose either that these tombs are later than those of Brittany, or that in the south metal was known earlier than in the north-west.

The Copper and Bronze Ages in France are well marked by a long series of findry-deposits, tombs and villages, these last in some cases protected by walls. In the tombs, some of the earlier of which are dolmenic, the rite of inhumation generally prevails in the first three of the four periods into which the Bronze Age is divided, while in the last incineration comes to the fore. The introduction of metal appears to have taken place gradually, and there is no evidence for attributing it to immigrants from outside.

About 900 B.C. the east and centre of France began to enjoy

the central European Early Iron Age culture known as Hallstattian I. This was followed by Hallstattian II, which spread over the greater part of France, and even extended over the Pyrenees into Andalusia.

From 500 B.C. onward the civilization of France was that known as La Tène. This culture takes its name from a site near Marin, at the north end of Lake Neuchâtel in Switzerland. Here, in the shallows, existed for several centuries a settlement built on piles. The steady development of the types of safety-pin or fibula found in large numbers among the remains has been made the basis of chronological division, and can be traced without a break until it is interrupted by the incursion of Roman types of the Imperial Period. Opinions differ slightly as to the precise dates to which the various stages of the La Tène culture are to be attributed, and the moment at which it came under full Roman influence naturally varies from place to place. In Switzerland, for instance, La Tène I is roughly dated from 400 to 200 B.C., La Tène II from 200 to 50 B.C., and La Tène III from 50 B.C. onward, with a considerable admixture of Roman civilization. In France, on the contrary, La Tène I is considered to end about 250 B.C., La Tène II about 150 B.C., while La Tène III takes us down to the borders of the Christian era. This La Tène culture, which forms the second part of the Early Iron Age in Europe, may be traced across Europe in a broad belt from Great Britain, through north and east France, Switzerland, south Germany, and Bohemia to Upper Austria, with outliers in north Italy.

The particular form of the La Tène culture which prevailed in the British Isles has been named the Late Celtic, the assumption being made that it was due to a Celtic-speaking population. Certain of the latest of the remains, notably some of those found in the cemeteries at Aylesford, are now with some degree of probability connected with that invasion of England by the semi-Teutonic Belgae which Julius Caesar mentions as having taken place previous to his own attack. Whether this be true or not it is clear that, at a time when in Europe the civilization of La Tène had already given way before that of Rome, it was enjoying its last and perhaps fullest development in our own country. To this phase the name La Tène IV is sometimes given, in order to bring it into line with the continental series.

From France to the British Isles it is, geographically, but a short step. Archaeologically, however, the two regions differ profoundly, a fact which is certainly to be explained by the remoter position of the British Isles, which rendered them less liable to

be seriously affected by the racial convulsions of Europe and the Mediterranean. For the palaeolithic period see vol. 1, p. 45.

The neolithic period in Great Britain is best represented by the interments in the Long Barrows. These are simple megalithic tombs of various forms covered by mounds of earth of an elongated plan. They occur most frequently in the south-west of England in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Somerset and Gloucestershire. In these counties the burials are invariably inhumations. On the other hand in certain barrows in Yorkshire and Westmorland, which both from their shape and their date would seem to belong to the Long Barrow group, the burial rite is that of cremation. The people buried in the Long Barrows were a remarkably homogeneous race with dolichocephalic skulls.

To the neolithic period, though with considerable diffidence, are generally assigned the other megalithic monuments of England and Wales, the stone circles and the dolmens. In England the dolmens are almost, though not quite, confined to Devon and Cornwall, in the latter of which counties they are distinctly common, especially west of Falmouth¹. In Wales they appear sporadically, on or near the south coast, and along the shores of Cardigan Bay, becoming comparatively frequent in Anglesea. Unfortunately most of these tombs have been ransacked in the past, and data for determining their period are lacking. No dolmens have been reported from Scotland, but they are frequent in nearly every part of Ireland. Here they seem to have developed, for we find along with them their derivatives, corridor-tombs, in great number and variety. At Carrowmore in Sligo, for instance, there is a veritable cemetery of tombs very similar to the *allées couvertes* of France. At Lough Crew in county Meath is a line of chamber-tombs which extends for three miles along the hill sides. These tombs are by no means neolithic in date, for they yield objects of bronze and even iron. The orthostatic blocks of which chamber and corridor are constructed are in some cases adorned with incised ornaments, including spirals. Similar designs are also found in the corridor-tomb of New Grange, near Drogheda, which is covered with a huge mound of stone. Unfortunately the date of this tomb is uncertain.

Stone circles are found in many parts of the British Isles. In England we need only mention those of Stonehenge, Avebury, Rollright, Arbor Low, and Stanton Drew in Somerset. With

¹ On this point see an interesting paper by W. J. Perry in *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, vol. 65, Part II, Paper XIII (1920-1).

regard to the date of these there is little to be said. The objects found at Stonehenge are all of stone, though this in itself would by no means preclude a date early in the metal age. A copper stain found on a certain block of worked stone 7 feet below the surface hardly constitutes convincing evidence.

In Scotland three separate types of stone circle occur. Those found in Inverness and those found near Aberdeen are tombs. Those of the western mainland and islands are probably not. Of the numerous stone circles found in Ireland, the most striking are those of Lough Gur, near Limerick.

The early Bronze Age in England is represented by the majority of the Round Barrows. These are much more widely distributed than the Long Barrows, they occur from Northumberland to Wiltshire, and from Denbigh to Lincolnshire. They can hardly be said to be megalithic, for the tomb which they cover is at the best a mere cist lined with slabs, and in some cases the skeleton or the urn containing the burnt bones has no other covering than a small cairn of stones. The mounds are circular in plan and conical in form. Cremation and inhumation are both exemplified in the burials, one or the other rite appearing to predominate in particular localities. The skeletons recovered from the Round Barrows are frequently those of a brachycephalic people who form a strong contrast to the long-headed race of the Long Barrows. But along with these broad heads dolichocephalic skulls of the old neolithic type are found, justifying the belief that the Bronze Age population of England and Wales was a mixed one. Occasional implements of copper and bronze are found in the Round Barrows. The pottery which the burials yield is homogeneous in type, and generally includes certain vessels destined to particular uses in the tomb—the urn, the drinking-cup, the food-vessel and the incense-cup. In the earliest of the Round Barrows the drinking-cup takes the form of the bell-shaped vase or beaker which has already been noticed as occurring in some of the dolmen-tombs of France. The later stages of the Bronze Age in England are better represented by hoards of bronzes and by sporadic finds than by burials. These islands felt but weakly the influence of the Hallstatt civilization which overspread central Europe at the beginning of the Iron Age, but in the south-eastern counties there developed a local form of the La Tène culture which reached a high artistic level (see above, p. 593).

Such are the phenomena presented by France and the British Isles in the prehistoric period. What is the interpretation of them?

Here there is no lack of theories, but there is little or nothing which amounts to proof. In both countries we find in the neolithic period a long-headed race established, and in both cases there appears during or just after the end of the neolithic era a broad-headed people. For the moment, many archaeologists have accepted either entire or in a modified form Sergi's idea that the neolithic population of south Europe and of France, Spain and the British Isles represents various branches of a long-headed race which entered Europe from north Africa in the early neolithic period, and which he calls the Mediterranean Race (p. 564). At the same time it may be that in some areas at least the problem is not so simple as this, and the resemblance of the French neolithic type to that of Cro-Magnon may really, as has been suggested, be due to a direct survival from palaeolithic times¹.

With regard to the broad-headed peoples some have sought to solve the question by the hypothesis of an immigration of Aryans into central Europe from some point either in or on the borders of Asia. That a movement of some sort must be postulated to account for the Aryan language is clear, but its direction, its date and its origin are hypothetical (see p. 28 *sq.*), and, above all, the assumption that no broad-headed type can exist in early Europe which is not that of an Aryan-speaking people is a dangerous one. Nowhere is the problem more intricate than in England. Here a tall, broad-headed people first appears with the Round Barrows, and there is an *a priori* probability that they are immigrants. Some, having regard to the frequency with which the beaker or bell-shaped drinking-cup occurs in the earliest of these barrows, speak of a 'beaker-people' whom they bring from central Europe, where the beaker is very common (see vol. I, pp. 100 *sqq.*). As against this it may be urged that the simplest form of the beaker is also found in late neolithic and early metal age tombs in Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain, Portugal and France, and that it is by no means certain whether it can be associated with any particular people at all (see vol. I, pp. 100 *sqq.*). The difficulty is heightened by the complications of the Celtic question. Celtic is strictly a philological term, the name of a language and not of a people. The Celtic languages of these islands are of two types, Goidelic, which includes the languages of Ireland, Scotland and the Isle of Man, and Brythonic, which includes those of Wales and Cornwall, which are akin to that of Brittany. The supposition is

¹ Cf. also the possibility of palaeolithic survivals in Spain and Portugal (p. 585) and even in modern Wales (Fleure and James in *J.R.A.I.* XLVI, 1916, pp. 35-153).

that a first wave of people, consisting of Goidels, invaded England and was driven out into Wales, Scotland and Ireland by a second wave consisting of Brythons. Unfortunately there is no agreement either about the date of these invasions or the archaeological remains with which either people or both should be identified (see also, pp. 33 *sqq.* above).

VI. THE MEGALITH-BUILDERS

There is another question on which it seems difficult to arrive at an agreement. Are the megalithic monuments of France and the British Isles to be attributed to the original neolithic population of these areas, or must we explain them as due to immigration? The answer to this must depend on that given to the problem of the dissemination of the megaliths in general, which is discussed elsewhere in this chapter. Here we need treat only one point in this connection. Some find it necessary to explain the spiral designs on the tombs of Lough Crew and New Grange as due to Aegean influence, and they welcome the spirals of the Gav'r'inis *allée couverte* in Brittany as marking a stage on the route. The cogency of this argument is a matter of grave doubt. Predynastic Egypt and south Russia both certainly evolved the spiral independently of the Aegean. Megalithic Malta was acquainted with the spiral, but the evidence for any connection whatsoever with the Aegean is still unsatisfactory¹. In fact the assumption of a single origin for the spiral is one which the facts do not justify. The spirals of New Grange will never suffice to prove Aegean influence in Great Britain. Similarly the decorated chalk drums found in a tomb at Folkton, in Yorkshire, with their geometric ornament and crude representation of the human eyes and eyebrows, may quite well be a British production, and we have no need to explain them as due to Aegean influence, still less as imports from the Mediterranean.

The fluted beads of blue glazed material from a tomb at Tan Hill, in Wiltshire, and from other barrows, are no longer believed to be of Egyptian make and we must therefore not assume, as some have done, that a hand-to-hand trade from Egypt to the British Isles existed at an early date². Hypothetical, moreover, is the supposed early exploitation of the

¹ See, however, Sir Arthur Evans, *The Palace of Minos*, I, pp. 262-3 and notes, with Lexow's work there quoted.

² *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scotland*, ix, pp. 141-2. Evans, *op. cit.* pp. 491-7, and fig. 352.

Cornish tin mines by Mediterranean peoples. It has yet to be proved that the Cassiterides are the British Isles or part of them, and the idea of Phoenician mariners sailing round by the Atlantic for tin as early as 1500 B.C. is hardly to be reconciled with what we know of the Mediterranean at that period. At the same time, we can quite definitely establish the existence of a trade in gold between the British Isles and the near part of the continent, probably in the Bronze Age, for a certain type of crescent-shaped necklet (*lunula*) of this metal which is frequent in Ireland and was undoubtedly made of Irish gold, occurs sporadically in England, especially in the south-west, on the north-east coast of France, and in Denmark¹.

The megalithic buildings of the various districts of western Europe have been described in more or less detail in dealing with each district, but the question of their origin remains to be discussed. Three possible answers suggest themselves. The custom of building megalithic monuments may have arisen independently in the countries in which we find it. Or, it may have arisen among a single people, and spread to others connected with them by trade or other relations. Or, thirdly, the spread of the custom from a single centre over a large area may have been due to an actual migratory movement of the people among whom we are supposing it to have originated².

The first answer fails to account for the use of incongruously large blocks of stone, often brought from a considerable distance, for the erection of small structures. This is no 'natural system of primitive architecture' such as might have arisen in many places independently, but one which suggests that huge stones were thought to possess some special virtue and value by reason of their very size. Nor can the occurrence of 'Pelagic' or 'Cyclopean' masonry over a wide area be used as a parallel. It is the natural way of building an embankment wall where suitable material exists; it is found in Peru as well as in the Old World, and is, furthermore, employed by engineers at the present day. Further, this answer does not explain the use of large slabs set up on their edges which are the main characteristics of megalithic architecture; nor yet does it account for the similarities of detail

¹ For early trade with Great Britain see now R. Smith, 'Foreign relations in the neolithic period,' in *Proc. of the Prehistoric Soc. of East Anglia*, vol. III, pp. 14 *sqq.*

² The view that the dolmens and certain other types of megalithic tomb are imitations of Egyptian mastabas has found little acceptance among archaeologists.

which are to be noticed in them over the whole area in which they occur—such as the curved façades, the combination of orthostatic slabs and ashlar masonry, the small window-like openings in the end-slabs, and the cup-markings. The second answer, too, is not without its difficulties, for it is not easy to imagine how trade relations should, over so vast an area, have modified anything so sacred and conservative as religious and funerary customs to the extent of introducing new types of architecture for use in temple and tomb.

We are thus left with the theory of an actual migration or migrations to account for our phenomena, and it cannot be denied that this hypothesis, daring though it may seem, and perhaps incapable of proof on our present data, avoids many of the difficulties inherent in the two other explanations which have been put forward. If we accept this theory, the source of such a migration becomes a matter of interesting speculation. Some writers prefer an eastern, others a northern origin, while others again would suggest north Africa¹. There are certain considerations, in favour of this last view, while the entire lack, hitherto, of any megalithic monuments that can be with any certainty assigned to an early date is no proof to the contrary. If, indeed, the megalithic area were coterminous with that of the Mediterranean Race, or a portion of it, the problem would be simplified. Italian and Mediterranean neolithic civilization might then have been brought over from north Africa by a first migration; while megalithic architecture might have come with a second migration at the end of the neolithic age.

The distribution of these monuments is not inconsistent with a migration theory. Those of western Europe all lie along a possible sea route, occurring as they do in Malta, Lampedusa (those of south-eastern Italy must be an offshoot), Sardinia, Corsica, the Balearic Islands, Spain, Portugal, France, the British Isles, Belgium, Denmark, south-west Sweden, and the German shores of the Baltic; whereas the centre of Europe is almost entirely free from them (a solitary example has been recorded in Savoy). An eastern group is found in Bulgaria, the Crimea, the Caucasus, Syria, Palestine, Persia, India and Japan; and, for these it might be necessary to postulate a separate origin.

It will be objected that megalithic monuments are absent in certain places where they might have been expected, *e.g.* in

¹ See Mackenzie (*B.S.A.* xii, 230 *sqq.*) where he notes the African affinities of Aegean and Sardinian dress, which show that the Mediterranean Race came from a place where the loin-cloth was the dress of both sexes.

Pantelleria, Sicily and southern and central Italy, a fact which undoubtedly requires explanation. We may perhaps find it in the unsuitability of the material available—in the extreme hardness of the limestone of the central Apennines, and the clayey material of which much of central Italy is composed; while the absence of megalithic monuments in the volcanic districts may be due either to this cause or to the activity of the volcanoes themselves. In Pantelleria the unsuitability of the material has been observed; while in Sardinia, in the Sassari district, which yields no natural slabs suitable for the construction of 'tombs of the giants,' we have two imitations of such tombs cut in the soft porous limestone.

As against this north African origin for the megalithic monuments of the western Mediterranean a view has quite recently been put forward which would seek their source in Spain and Portugal¹. The author of this theory feels very strongly the difficulty involved in looking for an origin in north Africa, where such monuments as have been excavated prove to be late in date. He points out, too, that many of the dolmens of Portugal are not only early in date but primitive in form, and he would suggest that it was from this source that the dolmens and more complicated megalithic structures of the western Mediterranean were derived. With regard to the method of derivation, he does not postulate migration, but prefers to speak more generally of 'influence' or 'intercourse.'

The widely divergent theories which have been alluded to above will make it abundantly clear that the question is a difficult, if not, on present evidence, an insoluble one. It is still further complicated by the uncertainty as to the exact relation to each other of the megalithic monument and the rock-hewn sepulchre, to which reference has been made above. The latter is confined almost exclusively to the Mediterranean area, and, though we know that in some cases it was used by the builders of megalithic tombs, it perhaps reached its greatest development precisely in those parts of the Mediterranean where megalithic monuments are lacking, particularly in Egypt, Cyprus and Crete. Since these are all centres of much higher civilizations than those found at the same date in any parts of the megalithic area, we can hardly seek to explain their use of the rock-tomb as due to influences emanating from the megalithic builders. We must therefore suppose either that these latter learned the use of the rock-

¹ See E. Thurlow Leeds, 'The Dolmens and Megalithic Tombs of Spain and Portugal,' in *Archaeologia*, vol. LXX (1920), p. 201; also *Liv. A. A.*, vol. I, pp. 95 sqq.

sepulchre from their more advanced neighbours, such as the Egyptians and Cretans, for which there is no evidence whatsoever, or else, what is far more probable, that they evolved it independently for themselves. It will also have been noticed that some of the districts we have described have groups of megalithic monuments which present considerable diversities from one another. It is, however, quite in accordance with the theory here tentatively adopted that the simplest form, that of the dolmen, should be the most widespread, while the complicated forms developed on special lines in different places.

CHAPTER XXII

THE RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF THE GREEKS

I. THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GREEK POLYTHEISM

THE religious beliefs and practices of any highly civilized people will be found to exhibit variety and inconsistency. A wide discrepancy divides the poets and philosophers at one end of the scale from the vulgar superstitious at the other. In the case of the Greeks these varieties are peculiarly marked and even in that middle sphere, which lies between the higher thought and vulgar superstition and exhibits 'the average meaning of religion for the nation,' incongruities constantly challenge attention. The ritual of the *Būphonia* seems indeed old-fashioned in the Athens of Aristophanes, and it is curious to remember that the audiences which set the seal of popular approval upon the profoundly religious dramas of Aeschylus, were the same comrades of Salamis, who had made sure of victory by procuring the two ancient wooden images of the Aeacidae to lead them into battle.

Further, we are liable in the ordinary way to forget the variety of civilization within the Greek-speaking world. We tend to think in terms of Greek literature and art with Athenian democracy for their background, though Athens was in fact but one of many states varying in their degree of civilization. The Aetolians of Thucydides' day were but little further advanced in culture than the pirates of Homer's, and in the mountains of Arcadia the practice of human sacrifice survived into the second century A.D.

Multiplicity of rituals or sects would equally confront the historian of Christianity or Islam, but a multiplicity of a different kind. He would naturally begin by defining the doctrine and ritual of the established churches and proceed to classify the non-conforming branches by the degree and character of their differences from orthodoxy. But no such simplicity of approach is possible in the case of Greek religion. It does not possess in our sense the conception of orthodoxy. It provides no creed the acceptance of which is necessary to the soul's salvation. The mystical religions, it is true, reserved the pleasures of the next

world for initiates who had acquired certain knowledge, performed certain rites and adopted certain rules of living; but they inspired no persecution of the uninitiated, who were at liberty to go their own way to Hell, nor were they exclusive in their demands upon the allegiance of their votaries. The initiated performed the ordinary sacred duties which national or personal piety enjoined and, before the emergence of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world, membership of a religious association did not conflict with the performance of public worship.

In the religion of the state there were no articles of faith to which the citizen must subscribe and Greek religion is not one of the 'religions of a book.' Homer has been called the 'Bible' of the Greeks, and it is true that the systematic mythology of Homer and Hesiod coloured and even directed the development of religious thought. But the poems of the inspired bards were never regarded by the Greeks as works of divine revelation which must be accepted as literally true, nor was scientific speculation barred by any dogma as to the creation of the world which it was impious to question. These negative characteristics had indeed their temporal advantages. Religious persecution and wars of religion, as known to later European history, play no part in the history of Greece, and at no time were the Greeks a priest-ridden people.

The positive characteristics of Greek religion are those of an anthropomorphic polytheism. A number of deities, conceived on the analogy of human personality and represented by art in human form, were common objects of worship to the Greek race as a whole. Their functions and provinces were to some extent specialized, and individual members of the pantheon were distinguished and recognizable by generally accepted traits. But owing to the absence of dogma there is no rigid system of theological definition, and consequently a great variety of particulars may be embraced under the universal concept of any divine name. A particular deity may hold a different status in the Olympian hierarchy for different worshippers, and local patriotism particularly is bound to emphasize the importance of the local deity. At Athens, for example, 'the goddess' is Athena, and for Athenians her significance overshadows that of her peers and even that of Zeus, just as in Roman Catholic countries a local saint has sometimes a more intense reality in the religious life of his people than the Virgin or the members of the Trinity.

Although in the higher thought, and even in popular theology, as expressed in the cults of Zeus, there are vague tendencies

which make eventually for monotheism, the actual development of Greek religion is in the opposite direction, towards a multiplication of numbers and a confusion of persons. The expression of the particular aspects of a deity's character or activities in cult-titles involves a subdivision of the conception of the god or goddess concerned into a number of specialized manifestations, while the titles themselves may become detached to form independent personalities of legend and even of cult. Thus Euboea, Prosymna and Acraea, cult-titles of Hera, become mythical nurses of the goddess, and Themis, Nike, and Peitho, who acquire individuality and independent cults, are in origin but titles of Gē, Athena and Aphrodite respectively. The non-dogmatic character of Greek polytheism added further to the confusion because it made it easy to include foreign deities in the pantheon by addition or identification.

The first process, which led the Zeus of Lucian to complain that the Oriental gods had crowded out Olympus, was operative at least as early as the advent of the foreigner Dionysus. And the supposition that foreign gods were but Hellenic gods worshipped under other names no less profoundly affected religious development from very early times. For such identifications inevitably modified the conception of the Greek god concerned and made Greek theology and cult peculiarly susceptible to the influence of alien religions. As the result of these tendencies, the person of a Greek deity may be reduplicated in a series of nominally independent figures; such persons, for example, as Atalanta or Callisto are but forms of the goddess Artemis. And strange anomalies may arise from the divergent development of different cults of the same divinity; the same name is given to 'the queen and huntress chaste and fair' and to the many-breasted fertility goddess of the Ephesians. On the other hand, the identification of different goddesses with different local variations of the same aboriginal goddess may lead to the opposite result that goddesses of different names possess identical functions.

As the result, then, of the inherent tendencies of polytheism, aggravated by the historical conditions of the birth of Greek civilization, which sprang from the fusion of diverse tribes belonging to two distinct racial stocks, multiplicity and confusion are characteristic of Greek religion. There is no people, however, to whose whole mental outlook chaos was so repugnant as the Greeks. Their whole thought, not merely their aesthetic, moves towards an ideal of artistic and precise definition, repudiating the Oriental's admiration of mere size or the indefinite outlines of

emotional mysticism. Their political constitutions are logical schemes not, like that of Rome, the outcome of an illogical series of adjustments of detail to meet practical needs as these from time to time arose. Their speculation reaches always for the universal behind the particulars and assumes an order in a rational universe. It is inevitable that a people of this temper will feel the want of order in the bewildering chaos of their theology; and even in the most conservative and therefore least tractable department of human life, there is a movement not imposed from without, but working in response to a need of national character, towards system. The two chief agents in this movement are mythology and art.

There is a well-known passage in Herodotus in which he states that Homer and Hesiod 'made the generations of the gods for the Greeks, and gave them their names and distinguished their offices and crafts and portrayed their shapes.' This is an overstatement, but it contains an element of truth. The purpose of the mythological poems attributed to Hesiod is to discover order in the celestial world, to resolve inconsistencies and to bring the various gods and legends into relation with each other. Much of Hesiod's material is crude, and the method of reconciliation leads sometimes to unfortunate results. For the all-embracing concupiscence of Hesiodic deities may be in part explained by the necessity of reconciling the multiple claims of human genealogies to a divine ancestry. But both by Homer and Hesiod great moral principles were discovered and proclaimed as inherent in the theological cosmos, and though the philosophers may deride the human weaknesses of Homeric gods as incompatible with divinity, the work of the poets both marks and furthers a great spiritual advance. Although their poems had not the force of dogma or creed, they had none the less a great moral influence. They made articulate, defined and popularized what their contemporaries thought about their gods, and inevitably the mental picture which man makes of his divinities will profoundly affect his ethical and religious outlook.

The diffusion of the poems of Homer and Hesiod throughout the Greek-speaking world made for uniformity and order in religious belief. It helped to establish a common pantheon of divine personalities whose individual characteristics, provinces of authority and relationship to each other were defined. The conception of the gods is intensely anthropomorphic, and the Homeric deities who fall asleep, or journey to their favourite seats of worship, display human passions and weaknesses. Sorrow, anger

and even sulkiness are to be found upon Olympus. But though anthropomorphism has its obvious limitations, the gods of Homer and Hesiod are human beings writ not merely larger but also fairer. An anthropomorphic god, in any event, is a nobler source of inspiration than a fetish, animal, or dead man. And Homer's gods, with all their shortcomings, are the aristocracy of the universe; they may be distinguished from mankind not merely by their greater power, but no less by the dual excellence which on earth distinguishes a divinely-descended chieftain from a Ther-sites, by physical beauty and a corresponding nobility of character.

A further feature of the poetic theology may be noticed here. There is no emphasis upon the creation of man, about which indeed inconsistent accounts are given. The universe is held to have existed before the gods, and the myth of its origin from Chaos is nearer akin to the physical speculations of the philosophers than to the narrative of Genesis. Nor are the Olympians the earliest dynasty in heaven. Cronos and his Titans preceded Zeus; and Tartarus for Homer is not the torture-chamber of the damned, but the subterranean prison in which the victorious usurper confined his predecessors. But though 'fallen angels' thus play a part in the Greek theogony, there is no conception of a warfare between the Principles of Good and Evil like that inherent in Zoroastrianism or Christianity. Only in those Orphic doctrines which centre round the Titans and Dionysus Zagreus is there a hint of a theory of dualism and original sin. Thanks to this absence of a personification of Evil and to the inherent geniality of an idealizing anthropomorphism the worship of the Olympians has throughout a friendly character. Their sacrifices provide feasts for their worshippers and their festivals are happy entertainments in which they share. It must often have struck readers of Aristophanes as a curious phenomenon that heaven furnishes butts for the comic stage at a religious festival. It cannot be that the people were indifferent to blasphemy. The political consequences of the mutilation of the Hermae are proof to the contrary. It is, probably, but an example of the friendliness of Greek worship that Dionysus or Heracles would no more be expected to take offence at the licensed libels of comedy than did in fact the human Socrates.

In diffusing a common conception of the deities of the pantheon, art carried on the work of the poets. The importance and degree of its influence may perhaps be illustrated from our own experience. Consider—*si parva licet componere magnis*—the relation of Tenniel's illustrations to our conception of the inhabitants

of Wonderland. The appearance and to some degree the character of the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle have been fixed for us by them. An innovator has no chance: this, we should say to him, may be an ingenious monster, but it is not a Mock Turtle. In a similar way, the plastic and, to a lesser degree, the ceramic arts fixed and standardized the divine types and won for them universal recognition. And art like poetry makes for idealism; though its influence begins later, its effect upon a people so sensitive to aesthetic impression was no less real. In the days of aniconic worship one pillar, cone, or upright log was hardly distinguishable from another of its kind. Increasingly as art became more articulate it differentiated and defined the various deities. Further, it worked for anthropomorphism. Cult-ritual knew deities who hovered between animal and human shape; but art, like Homer, will have none of theriomorphism. There are but two instances of divine images in beast form recorded by Pausanias, and one of these had disappeared long before his day. Here art exercised a refining influence upon popular theology. The beast in which the god may once have manifested himself is sometimes figured in attendance upon him; but divinity itself is purged of the bestial, and is uniformly represented in human form, embodying a personality which, if we may trust the evidence of that characteristic convention of early Greek sculpture, the 'archaic smile,' is genial and beneficent like that of the poet's conception.

The refining and spiritualizing influence of art increased with the growing powers of artistic expression. Making every allowance for the rhetorical bent of the later classical writers, their testimony to the effect produced by the masterpiece of Phidias at Olympia is unanimous and cannot be devoid of truth. 'The beauty of the statue,' says Quintilian, 'even made some addition to the received religion; the majesty of the work was equal to the god.'

II. GREEK MYTHS AND THE WORSHIP OF POWERS OF NATURE

Myth arises from an attempt to give an explanation of some phenomenon which is not understood and to satisfy that natural curiosity which has made both savages and children inveterate romancers. Imagination may often work upon obvious lines and in many parts of the world may produce similar answers to similar enquiries. There are Antipodean analogies to the story of Cronos; and the tale of Pandora, or How evil came into the World, belongs to a familiar type. But apart from the standing riddles of

the universe, almost any unexplained object, circumstance, or rite may give rise to legend. In particular, ritual is a fertile source of myth. A large part of primitive ritual is dramatic in character. It is, in effect, an acted narrative-charm, employing gesture and action in place of language. The action of such ritual has often its counterpart in myth.

Religion, again, is intensely conservative, and rites often outlive the memory of their original meaning. When this occurs, new reasons are discovered for time-honoured practice, and a new myth comes into being. This familiar process draws attention to the essential contrast between ritual and myth. Ritual is conservative and persists unaltered, but myth is fluid. Only where myth becomes stereotyped as dogma, does it become rigid; and, only in a religion where the emphasis is placed upon a creed, can myth attain the fixity of ritual. Greek religion, however, laid no emphasis upon what the worshipper believed but much upon his proper performance of ritual ceremonies. Greek myth is, therefore, highly changeable and fluid. It is sensitive to all the influences which at different times may affect popular imagination, while unexplained or misunderstood customs, rites, or even names are continuously throwing off new legends. This continual transformation renders mythology difficult to handle, for it is often impossible to date the component parts of a story; and, unless something of the circumstances of its origin are known, it is difficult to be sure that we are approaching it from the right end.

In the case of Greek mythology a further difficulty is added to the uncertainty which besets all interpretations of mythological evidence. Greek myths have been continuously worked over from very early days, and are therefore known to the modern scholar in a form which is already distorted. Even the degree of system introduced by Homer and Hesiod necessitated selection and adjustment of the original material. The same kind of distortion in a more aggravated form may be seen at work in the attempts of the Christian Fathers to adjust the mythical history of Greece and Rome to the chronology imposed by the biblical account of the Creation. Secular motives, again, have led to the falsification of early genealogical and mythical history. The allegorical interpretation of mythology also began in classical times. As early as the fifth century B.C. Metrodorus of Lampsacus was explaining that the Olympian gods were the personifications of physical principles, and the Homeric heroes symbolical representations of the aether, sun or moon. Later, Euhemerus (c. 280 B.C.) proved from mythology that the gods were human kings and benefactors

deified by the grateful memory of mankind. For later antiquity in general allegory provided an easy method of reconciling the earlier theology with the theories of physical science or philosophy. At the close of paganism Sallustius explains that 'myths state the existence of the gods to all, but who and what they are only to those who understand.' The intrinsic difficulties of handling mythological evidence are thus aggravated by the bias of our sources of information. Mythology nevertheless presents reflections of primitive ideas and institutions, and its testimony cannot be ignored. To some extent its interpretation can be checked by the analogies provided by the mythologies and religious practices of other peoples.

The attempt of Max Müller to deduce from mythology the aboriginal solar religion of the 'Aryan' race no longer demands serious discussion. The philological hypothesis upon which his theory was based is now known to have been mistaken; and his belief that the Vedas represent an Aryan liturgy of prehistoric antiquity has been proved by subsequent research to be unfounded. The theory, however, that the original character of the Greek gods, as personifications of aspects or departments of nature, can be deduced from the interpretation of mythology, has continued to maintain a certain popularity, particularly in Germany.

Now, it would be going too far to deny that some Greek myths may have solar or even astronomical significance. The legends which centre round the Argonauts and some elements in the story of Heracles may have a solar meaning. It is possible that the Golden Lamb of Atreus has some connection with the zodiac, and that the fifty daughters of Selēnē and Endymion represent the fifty months of the Olympiad. But though such nature myths may exist, it remains to be proved, firstly, that they represent an early or original stratum of religious thought; secondly, that the astronomical element is not of foreign origin; and, thirdly, that all Greek mythology is of this character.

That every Greek myth must be 'highly poetical talk about the weather' is an assumption which is justified neither by internal evidence nor by the comparative evidence afforded by the mythologies of other peoples. The method of interpretation which seeks to show from mythology that the Greek gods originated in the personification of natural phenomena arouses misgiving by the far-fetched improbabilities in which it involves its votaries. But it stands self-condemned by the fact that it owes such plausibility as it possesses to adopting as an axiom the improbable proposition which it has set out to prove. The supposition, for

example, that the tasselled goat's skin (*aegis*), which was worn by Zeus and Athena, represents the thunder-cloud will not commend itself to common sense as a probable interpretation unless the initial assumption has been made that these deities must necessarily be personifications of nature.

In the actual worship of historical Greece personifications of powers of nature played but a subordinate part. In Greek religion and folklore the powers of nature were accorded a general but vague reverence. Among the powers invoked in the Homeric oath are Earth, Sun and Rivers, and the same witnesses occur upon inscriptions recording treaties. In general, rivers were regarded as *κουροτρόφοι* (nurturers of the young) and to them were dedicated the locks shorn at adolescence. There was a popular belief in nature-spirits, nymphs, naiads and nereids—generally but not invariably of the gentler sex—who bestowed inspiration, or inflicted madness, but retained also the beneficent quality of water-spirits who protected the growth of children. The wild spirits of the mountain, the centaurs, had little significance for the Greeks of historical times beyond supplying a purely decorative element in literature and art. Neither nymphs nor rivers developed cults of any real importance to Greek religion as a whole. Sacrifice may be made to them; they sometimes possess priests and demesnes (*τεμένη*); but no temples were built in their honour, and the sacred places of their undivided worship were local natural shrines like that described in the *Odyssey*¹. They seem indeed to lack the individuality necessary for a universal cult, and such personality as they developed tended to be local merely. 'The names of all of them,' says Hesiod, 'it were troublesome for a mortal man to tell, but in each case they know them, whosoever dwell round about them.' So far as the nymphs partake in more than local cult, they figure as subordinate to some greater deity.

Sacrifices were offered to the winds for naval victory in the Persian war, and Boreas was made a citizen of Thurii; but such attention as the winds received in religion or magic was mainly inspired by the idea of averting damage to the crops. And though their connection with the underworld seems to have led to the cult of wind-spirits as ancestral powers at Athens, it cannot be claimed that they attained any importance in Greek cult as a whole. The moon in Greek religion plays an unimportant part and Uranus has little reality outside myth, while the learned folly

¹ *Odyssey*, XIII, 103, 356. A wayside altar to nymphs where an artificial fountain had been constructed, *Odyssey*, XVII, 208.

of astrology transmitted from the East first fastened upon Greece in her decline.

Of the witnesses to the Homeric oath there remain the all-seeing Sun and Mother Earth. Of these the Sun (Hēlios) achieved the dignity of a major cult, but the area of its distribution is limited. Only at Rhodes was his worship of the first importance in classical times. Outside this island there are traces of his cult in Crete and Lacedaemon, while the earlier stratum of Corinthian legend possibly betrays solar elements. The worship of the Sun thus appears to be restricted to the southern Aegean, and it is very probably of pre-Hellenic or foreign origin.

Earth has generally been regarded by mankind in a certain stage of development as both the source of life and the home of the dead; and she herself is subject with the changing seasons to the death of winter and the resurrection of the spring. These ideas have been traced in the religious beliefs and practice of peoples in all parts of the world, and the reverence paid to Earth may well have been common alike to the invading Indo-Europeans and to the Mediterranean peoples of the Bronze Age. That such conceptions are to be found in an early stratum of Greek religious belief is shown by the Dodonean liturgy. 'Zeus was and is and will be. Hail great Zeus! Earth brings forth fruits, wherefore call on Mother Earth.' The connection of the worship of Gē with the third day of the *Anthestēria* at Athens illustrates the natural association of Mother Earth with the dead. As the goddess of the underworld she is, further, the sender of dreams and the goddess of divination. Tradition credibly affirms that she preceded Apollo at Delphi, and it is possible that the god's victory over Python reflects the subordination of the older earth goddess to the new Olympian.

Of direct personifications of departments or powers of nature Earth alone possessed an important cult which was universally recognized. But even her functions tend to be transferred to more concrete and complex divine personalities, to Demeter or Rhea-Cybele; while her cult-titles Themis, Aglauros, Pandōra, under the anthropomorphic influences which dominate Greek religious imagination, become detached and develop independent personality. The mythological derivation of Greek deities from a series of personifications of departments or powers of nature in fact derives no support from the Greek cults of historical times, and the tendencies revealed by the worship of Gē point rather in the opposite direction.

III. AEGEAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN ELEMENTS IN GREEK RELIGION

Recent British scholarship has pursued the quest for origins by a different route. It has taken its stand upon the historical fact that the Greeks represent the fusion of central European tribes with the Mediterranean people of the Bronze Age, to whom the label 'Pelasgian' is often applied. The Homeric poems, it is suggested, are not primitive, but represent the tradition of the northern racial element which superimposed the cults of the Olympian gods upon an older 'Pelasgian' worship. Examination shows that Greek religion falls roughly into two categories: (*a*) Olympian worship, in which sacrifices are cooked and are offered in order to earn the gratitude of Heaven, and (*b*) Chthonian, in which sacrifices are burned and are piacular or expiatory in character. The two categories, it is suggested, roughly correspond to the two racial elements of which the Græeks were composed.

Although the pursuit of this line of enquiry has illumined much that was previously obscure in Greek religious practice and belief, it is doubtful (*a*) whether the racial elements in Greek religion can be distinguished with the certainty implied, and (*b*) whether primitive and emotional elements in Greek religion, which it is attempted to show were 'Pelasgian,' are really amenable to the classification adopted. The worship of Dionysus, for instance, contains primitive and emotional elements, but the god is almost certainly Indo-European, nor were his sacrifices holocausts. Further, there can be little doubt that the sanguine enthusiasm of the early days of anthropological investigation has tended to exaggerate the importance of primitive survivals, and has to some extent distorted our view of the character of Greek religion by an over-emphasis upon the problem of origins. It has been suggested, for example, that Greek religion retained elements of savagery of a primitive type from which it had but recently emerged; and a statement of Herodotus that the Pelasgians worshipped gods without names has been quoted in support of a theory that the background to the religion of classical Greece is formed by a 'Pelasgian' culture, which had not attained the conception of divine personalities but knew only the magical power of medicine-men called *theoi*.

It may be remarked that neither Herodotus nor his informants at Dodona were in a position to know what the religious practices of the Bronze Age were; and indeed, his assertion is not based upon observation of fact, but is the corollary of a mistaken theory

that the names of the Greek gods were derived from Egypt. But in any case the view suggested lacks historical perspective. Clearly, before the invasions of the second millennium B.C. the Greeks, and therefore Greek religion in the strict sense, were non-existent. Of the two racial elements, from the fusion of which the Greeks sprang, the Indo-Europeans are known to have worshipped deities conceived upon the analogy of human personality before they arrived in the Balkan Peninsula. It follows that this 'Pelasgian' godless age, if it existed at all, must belong to the Mediterranean Bronze Age. But here the evidence of archaeology is surely decisive. If it can be shown that the Aegean peoples, centuries before the arrival of the Indo-Europeans, not only worshipped gods, but gods which were anthropomorphically conceived, the proximity of Greek religion to this hypothetical pre-deistic stage of culture falls to the ground.

It is true that no cult statues of Aegean deities have been found. The evidence, indeed, is overwhelming that Bronze Age ritual was aniconic, *i.e.* that the deity was represented in cult by a sacred tree or pillar or, less certainly, a double-axe. But there is *prima facie* no difficulty in the worship of anthropomorphic gods in aniconic form. In fact, the religious art of the Bronze Age frequently depicts cult-scenes in which a goddess or a god is represented in human shape, and upon a common type of Minoan gem the representation of the divinity is indifferently expressed by a pillar flanked by two heraldic animals, or by the human form of the deity with similar supporters.

Upon the religion of the Aegean peoples Egypt no doubt exerted an influence. But its true affinities are with Anatolian worship, and with those goddess-cults which the Semites themselves may have derived from a Mediterranean source. There can be little doubt that Aegean religion belonged to a type of which variations were prevalent in Asia Minor and upon the coasts of the eastern Levant in historical times. In this religion the figure of a great mother-goddess of nature is dominant. There appears also an armed male deity, apparently a sky-god and the wielder of the thunder (cf. p. 348). He is sometimes represented with rays, and the appearance of the sun and moon in cult-scenes suggests that the celestial bodies had some connection with Aegean divinities.

The worship of these divine beings, like that of Cybele in Asia Minor, appears to have had its principal centres in cave-sanctuaries on the mountains. No large temples have been discovered, and the sacred buildings represented in Aegean art uniformly consist of shrines of no very great size. Remains of such chapels

have been discovered; and, with one possible exception, they form part of a palace or larger building, which suggests that the king was also the religious head of his people. The type is clearly depicted upon the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, where the altar and pillar stand in front of a small roofless building in the middle of which grows a sacred tree. Ritual had clearly reached an elaborate stage. There are priests and priestesses who wear hieratic garments, and there is a considerable amount of ritual furniture, to some of which (*e.g.* the double-axe and the so-called 'horns of consecration') a very remote antiquity must be assigned.

That Aegean religion contained sinister elements is indeed probable. It is, however, a fallacy, as the example of Mexico may remind us, to suppose that human sacrifice and ritual barbarities are restricted to peoples of a primitive social and religious organization. Two characteristics are perhaps responsible for the darker side of Aegean worship: the significance attached to the cult of the dead and the orgiastic ritual of fertility cults.

For the first, the rich contents of the graves, the magnificent beehive-tombs of Mycenae, the pit-altars discovered above graves at Mycenae and Tiryns, the painted sarcophagi in which the bodies of the distinguished dead were interred—all testify to the importance attached to the care for the dead. That this care might become worship is shown by the long series of offerings at the Menidi tomb in Attica; and the paintings upon the sarcophagus, discovered at Hagia Triada, near Phaestus, reveal an elaborate ritual of sacrifice. In one of the scenes offerings are being made to the corpse, or possibly the statue of the dead man, standing upright, swathed from the shoulders in a ritual garment of skin, before a sacred shrine. Without the evidence of literature we are left to the uncertain guidance of conjecture and analogy; but it is not unreasonable to suppose that a religion which lays stress upon the worship of the dead will contain an element of fear. It was noticed in the excavation of the Kamares Cave that the offerings had evidently been brought in as far as the worshipper dared, and then thrown down the steep slope which runs into the dark recesses of the cave. And the ferocity of the monsters so frequently depicted upon Cretan gems points in the same direction. It is probable indeed that the men of the Bronze Age, unlike the Greeks, were a demon-haunted people.

Among many peoples the powers of the underworld have been associated with fertility. An illustration of this association is perhaps to be seen in the pictures of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus. It would appear that pre-Hellenic religion combined the worship

of spirits of the dead with that of deities of fertility, whose cave-sanctuaries were at once the dwellings of the powers of the wild and gate-ways to the underworld, whence the great mother sends up the new life of spring and whither in due season she gathers the dead things of winter. And the worship of these deities of nature seem to have belonged to a well-known orgiastic type. Certain cult-scenes have been thought to refer to the periodic death and mourning of the male deity, and this interpretation of evidence, in itself somewhat scanty, receives support from the analogy of Anatolian cults, like those of Attis and Adonis, from the persistent Cretan tradition of the grave of a mortal Zeus, and from the orgiastic characteristics of Cretan cults in classical times.

It is true that our records of the Cretan worship of the Zeus-child are late and it is impossible to detach the purely Orphic elements in it from the Cretan; but the very persistence of the claims for a Cretan origin for Dionysus and Orpheus supports the view that the main features of this worship may have been aboriginal. That both god and prophet were in fact of Thracian origin appears incontrovertible, but the early currency of the mistaken theory can be accounted for, if, when Dionysiac worship reached Crete, it found there an indigenous religion of a very similar character with which it easily became amalgamated. The emphasis laid upon the birth of the god, his rending by the Titans, and his subsequent resurrection, his association with goat and pig, the hanging of his image in a tree and the explicit statements of the Hymn of the Curētes discovered at Palaikastro, alike indicate a fertility cult of a well-known type. The general similarities to Corybantic cults of Asia Minor are obvious; and the birth of Zeus was localized also, though by a late tradition, at Sardes and Tralles. On the Greek mainland the cult of the goddess and the male divine child is to be found in the worship of Ilithyia and Sosipolis at Olympia, and that of the goddess Ino-Leucothea and the child Melicertes-Palaemon at the Isthmus of Corinth.

That the religion of historical Greece reflected the secular fusion of the Indo-European invaders with the Mediterranean peoples, upon whom they imposed their language and much of their social organization, is indisputable; certain of its broad characteristics may be provisionally assigned to one or other of the constituent racial elements. An exact assessment, however, of their respective contributions is impossible. In itself a fusion of races is a highly complex process which is more nearly analogous to a chemical change than to a mere process of addition; and,

except in the broadest outline, nothing is known of the historical facts and circumstances of the invasion of the Balkan peninsula. Literary evidence fails for the period before Homer, nor can archaeology at present fill the gap. Knowledge of the religion of the invaders is based mainly upon the evidence of the Homeric poems, which may be supplemented by what little is known of the religious beliefs and practices of other Indo-European peoples, and by deductions from the distribution of specific legends and cults. A few facts may be regarded as certain.

The invaders worshipped a number of gods and goddesses who were anthropomorphically conceived. One at least of these, Zeus, was common to all the tribes before the invasion, and general recognition was probably accorded also to the worship of Apollo and Poseidon. The social organization of the newcomers, who retained vestiges of a nomadic pastoral existence, was patriarchal and tribal in character, and their communities were bound together by the ties of kinship and religion. The invading races burned their dead before burial. Finally, certain names of Greek gods are admittedly Indo-European (Zeus, Dione, Hestia, Hera, Demeter), while others (Poseidon, Apollo) are probably so; and others again (Athena, Artemis, Aphrodite, Hephaestus) are almost certainly not Indo-European.

Outside these facts the historian is of necessity dealing in inferences and hypotheses of greater or less degree of probability. It cannot be assumed that what is un-Homeric is necessarily Aegean; nor are religious phenomena which have Aegean analogies necessarily derived from that source. The sacred tree, for instance, plays an important part in Aegean ritual, but there can be little doubt that the Indo-European sky-god was immanent in the oak (a species which occurs rarely if at all among the sacred trees of Minoan art) before his worshippers entered Greece or Italy.

The bull, again, is prominent in Aegean cult and Cretan legend; but there is reason to believe that it was independently a sacred animal for the Indo-Europeans, and it is certain that the Thracian Dionysus did not borrow his bull form from prehistoric Crete.

It would indeed be strange if the great Mediterranean goddess of the Bronze Age, who continued in classical times to dominate the worship of Asia Minor, had failed to leave her mark upon proto-Hellenic religion. That the northerners worshipped goddesses is clear from the Indo-European character of the names Dione, Hera and Demeter, while the latter name indicates that, though the wealth of the flesh-eating Homeric chieftains, their tribal institutions and the poetic imagery of their bards find ex-

pression in terms of pastoral life, they knew the arts of agriculture before their descent upon Greece.

But the social organization of the Olympian gods like that of their worshippers, was patriarchal. The Indo-European goddess tends to be the wife, subordinate in importance to her divine husband. Dione appears to have remained the wife of Zeus, and little more; and it is perhaps owing to the accident that she did not assimilate the local worship of a Mediterranean goddess that she became a shadowy and unimportant figure in the Greek pantheon. Hera at Argos and at Samos, the island of an aboriginal maiden-goddess, no doubt gained her relative importance from her fusion with the goddess of indigenous cults, and Demeter, the goddess of agriculture and the underworld, easily assimilated certain aspects of the Minoan nature goddess.

The goddesses Athena, Artemis and Aphrodite, who by the time of Homer have been adopted into the Hellenic pantheon—Athena whole-heartedly, Artemis securely, and Aphrodite with reservations—all bear names which are not Indo-European. All are in their earliest manifestations goddesses of child-birth and fertility; all are primarily conceived as dominant and unwedded, a characteristic only later refined into the conception of virgin chastity. Subordinate local types of the goddess frequently appear in Greek legend and cult, such as Atalanta, Pasiphaë, Britomartis, Dictynna, Ariadne and Callisto. Characteristic of the group as a whole are cults of a maiden-goddess which associate the deity with animal form, retain traditions of the sacrifice of a human being or a divine animal, and hieratic legends of the hurling of the heroine from a cliff into the sea, of the exposure of mother and child in a chest thrown into the sea, or of the hanging of the goddess in a tree. It can hardly be doubted that these divinities belong to the Mediterranean stratum of Greek religious belief.

It has been thought that the story of the dethronement of Cronos may reflect a religious change consequent upon secular conquest, and that the predecessor of Zeus was the god of the Bronze Age. Little weight can be attached to the argument that licence was granted to slaves at his festival because he remained peculiarly the god of the conquered population, for similar privileges to slaves and servants are a common feature of social religious festivals of a certain type. More convincing support is afforded (a) by the primitive character of the myths connected with Cronos, (b) by the taint of human sacrifice which attaches to him in Greek legend and in the cult of Rhodes and led antiquity to identify him with the Semitic Moloch, and (c) by his character

as a god of harvest and fertility. The fact that philology has been unable to give a satisfactory account of his name is in favour of the theory that he was aboriginal.

At first sight certain very primitive rites and legends, such as those connected with Lycaean Zeus, might be thought to be of Aegean origin. Arcadia, whose inhabitants in historical times claimed to be aboriginal, was closely connected with Crete and remained the home of cults of the goddess of wild beasts. Here, upon the summit of Mount Lycaeus, to which the priest ascended in times of drought to pray for rain, Zeus was worshipped in a barbarous ritual in which human sacrifice was retained, apparently as late as the second century A.D. No temple was erected upon the mountain, but there was an enclosure sacred to the god. Any person entering this sacred place was doomed to death, just as the members of the royal house of Athamas who entered the prytaneum at Alus in Thessaly were liable to be sacrificed to Laphystian Zeus. This Thessalian taboo was also connected with a story of human sacrifice; for the crime of Athamas, for which his descendants suffered, was the attempted sacrifice of Phrixus and Helle upon the Laphystian Mount.

At Megalopolis there was a similar enclosure to that on Mount Lycaeus, and here the cult-image of Lycaean Zeus consisted of two pillars with birds perched upon them, a form definitely to be connected with Aegean religious practice. Lycaon, the wolf-man, and Callisto, the bear-maiden, are the mythological figures associated with this worship, and there is reason to believe that Lycaon is a double of the god, and Callisto of the goddess of the wild. Lycaon in the story was turned into a wolf to punish him for daring to offer human flesh to the Olympian gods to eat. This story of the cannibal feast occurs elsewhere in Greek mythology (*e.g.* in the tales of Pelops, of the Banquet of Thyestes, and of Harpalyce and Clymenus), and it is probable that it originated in the explanation of a ritual of sacrament accompanied by human sacrifice. At Mount Lycaeus it was still believed in the time of Plato that human flesh was mingled with that of the other sacrificial victims at the festival of the god, and that the worshipper, who chanced to taste of this, turned into a wolf. In one version of the story those who thus became wolves were allowed to recover their human shape in the tenth year, provided that as wolves they abstained from human flesh. The nine year cycle again recalls Aegean analogies, for Minos, the king of Cnossus, was said to repair every nine years to the sacred cave to receive the ordinances of Zeus.

The ideas implicit in the rites and legends of the Lycaean cult are those which Sir James Frazer has elucidated in the *Golden Bough*. The god who controls the weather and the fruitfulness of nature is sometimes regarded as incarnate in a divine king, who, like Salmoneus in Greek legend, may himself make thunder by sympathetic magic. This god, upon whose vigour the prosperity of the land depends, may have his youth renewed by a periodic death and resurrection. The death is often accompanied by a sacrament in which the worshippers partake directly of the divine being. The sacrifice and sacrament may be carried out in the person of the royal representative, or of a member of the royal family, and alternatively or simultaneously in that of the animal representative of the god. For the purpose of ritual, again, the human subject of sacrifice is sometimes regarded as the incarnation of the deity in his animal form, a fact which has added to the confusion of legends of the substitution of animal for human, and human for animal sacrifice.

That these ideas belong to the earliest and most primitive stratum of Greek religion is certain, and that they found expression in Aegean religion is probable. There are also other links connecting some of the Greek legends and rites, in which they can be traced, with Crete. But examples of similar ideas have been collected from all parts of the world, and they can be traced in the religion or folklore of most peoples. Nor can an exclusively Aegean origin be claimed for their appearance in Greek religion. If Lycaean Zeus has associations with Crete, Dionysus, whose ritual and legends show the same characteristics in a marked degree, is an undoubted Indo-European from Thrace.

IV. PRIMITIVE SURVIVALS

In Greece, as elsewhere, the conservatism of religion retained survivals of a more barbarous past. In discussing these it is important to bear in mind the difference between the evidence of legend which belongs to the undated past, and that of actual ritual practice in historical times. Further, in the case of the latter it is necessary to notice whether at the given date the rite has become purely a formal observance, in some cases merely a pretence, or whether it retains its full vigour as the essential act of worship.

That human sacrifice was widely prevalent in early Greek religion there is abundant evidence in legend. The existence of stories of a cannibal sacrament has already been noticed. Nor are

there wanting numerous examples in Greek legend of royal persons who hold office by violence until such time as a stronger claimant can fight and slay them. Cynus at Pagasae, the northern end of the Hyperborean Way, who fought all comers and built a shrine of his victims' skulls, was eventually killed by Heracles. Sinis was tied by Theseus to the tree-tops by means of which he had torn his previous victims asunder, and by the same hero Sciron was kicked over the cliff into the sea in requital for the similar treatment which he had meted out to passers-by. These and the numerous similar stories in Greek legend are most probably to be explained as referring to the death of the divine king whose tenure is dependent upon the maintenance of his vigour, upon which the welfare of the community and the fertility of the land depend. The methods by which Sinis and Sciron were despatched have probably a ritual significance and may remind the reader of the legends of the hanging or throwing into the sea of female deities, to which reference has already been made. The story of how Icarius, who first brought Dionysiac worship into Attica, was torn in pieces by intoxicated peasants, points to the practice, or at least the ritual pretence, of human sacrifice in a peasant vegetation ritual, and a similar interpretation may possibly explain the fate of various legendary persons, some of them certainly connected with fertility, who were said to have been torn in pieces by animals (*e.g.* Linus, Actaeon, Anthos, Glaucus).

Again, there are fairly numerous references in legend to the self-devotion of a patriot or his sacrifice of his children in the hour of his country's need in time of war (*e.g.* Menoeceus or the daughters of Erechtheus), famine (*e.g.* the variously-named mother of Phrixus), or drought (*e.g.* Molpis at Elis for rain or Lophis at Haliartus for water). In tradition the Delphic oracle has the unenviable responsibility, which its policy may have earned in fact, for recommending human sacrifices of this kind. Some of them no doubt describe isolated sacrifices upon specific occasions; but in spite of the form of the story some may be aetiological explanations of a regularly recurrent ritual. Thus there is evidence of the annual sacrifice of a boy and girl to Artemis Triclaria in Achaëa, though the rite was discontinued in the historical period.

Ritual such as that indicated in legend actually existed in cult. At Leucas and in Cyprus human victims were hurled from the cliff in honour of Apollo. The stories of Orpheus and Pentheus, who were done to death by Maenads, have analogies in Dionysiac cult. Human sacrifice was offered to Dionysus Omadios in Chios and Tenedos, and to Dionysus Aigobolos at Potniaë; at the

festival of the *Agriōnia* at Orchomenus certain holy women were pursued by the priest with a drawn sword and killed if overtaken. Ovid seems to have known of a sacrifice by stoning at Abdera. There is also evidence of the resort to human sacrifice upon specific occasions. A persistent tradition alleges that it was practised in the Messenian wars; Themistocles is said to have sacrificed captives to Dionysus *Ōmēstēs* in the Persian wars; and in the fourth century B.C. the conscience of Pelopidas was seriously troubled by a dream which seemed to indicate that patriotism demanded the performance of the repugnant duty of sacrificing a maiden. Vestiges also survived of the practice of human sacrifice in a primitive form of fertility-ritual, in which the ashes of the victim were scattered upon the fields, and in a scape-goat ritual, in which the evils of the community were destroyed in the persons of human representatives.

There is abundant evidence therefore that human sacrifice played a large part in the earliest Greek religion; but in purely Greek cults during historical times the performance of such rites was rare and sporadic, and symbolic simulation often fulfilled the needs of a more humane age.

At each high festival
A sword, in record of thy death undone,
Shall touch a man's throat, and the red blood run—
One drop, for old religion's sake. In this
Shall live that old red rite of Artemis¹.

Again the make-believe of ritual might find a compromise satisfactory to religious conservatism in the substitution of an animal for a human victim or even, as in the comic story of the Thessalian who outbid his adversary by promising the sacrifice of a human hecatomb, in the yearly renewal of a promise never actually carried out.

Where the sacrifice was preserved measures were taken to mitigate its barbarity. Some form of life-saving apparatus appears to have been attached to those who made the leap from the Leucadian cliff, and both here and at Rhodes, where they were mercifully intoxicated before being despatched, the victims were chosen from criminals already condemned to death. In moments of desperate crisis that horror, which in all ages has invested human sacrifice with its supreme efficacy, may have led sporadically to its performance. But as a regular practice it was very rare; the notorious examples are the cults of Lycaean Zeus, Laphystian Zeus and Rhodian Cronos, and of these, Greek writers speak with

¹ Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 1458-61 (trans. Gilbert Murray).

a horrified reserve. In general, the practice of human sacrifice may be regarded as obsolete, at least by the fifth century B.C., nor is it probable that the *pharmakoi*, who acted as scape-goats for the ills of the community at the festival of the *Thargēlia*, were actually put to death at Athens in historical times.

The cult of animals seems to have been characteristic both of the Aegean and Indo-European peoples though the association of animals in cult need not necessarily imply their direct worship. The birds which figure upon the sacred pillars in Aegean art have been interpreted as representing the advent of the divinity to his cult-image. But further than this it would be hazardous to venture. The evidence for the direct worship of birds as pre-anthropomorphic deities is purely hypothetical, and comparative anthropology must give a verdict against its inherent probability. For though birds have almost universally magical status, a particular importance in weather magic, a frequent association with the spirits of the dead, and though they appear sometimes as the ministers or agents of spiritual powers or deities, or even as the forms which god or magician may assume for particular purposes, the fact remains that recorded examples of any definite cult of a bird are exceedingly rare in any stage of culture in any part of the globe. To the early magical status of the bird in Greece there is interesting testimony in the word *οἰωνός* which originally meant 'bird of prey,' but in ordinary use in the classical period signifies 'portent' or 'omen'; and in fact, though its popularity waned in historical times until its revival in the syncretistic period, divination by birds was the characteristic method of the heroic age. But for the existence of bird-cults no convincing evidence has yet been produced.

The animals of most importance in Minoan cult were the wild goat (*agrimi*), the bull and the snake. Their precise relation to the conception of divinity, archaeological evidence alone is not in a position to define. The supposition that the demons upon Minoan seals represent human dancers dressed in animal skins will find little support from an unbiased study of the actual designs.

The wolf, ram, bear, bull, goat, and horse are animals which give cult-titles to Greek gods, and are forms in which such deities as Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Dionysus or Poseidon may manifest themselves. The divinity of rivers takes almost indifferently a human or bovine shape; the powers of the underworld frequently appear as snakes. At Elis Dionysus was invoked as 'a goodly bull,' and at Tenedos a bull-calf dressed in buskins was sacrificed as the representative of the god. In many cults the

worshippers assumed the animal form of the god. The maidens of Attica danced the bear-dance in honour of Artemis Braurōnia, and functionaries at the festival of Poseidon at Ephesus were called 'bulls.' At the feast of *Būphonia* at Athens the ox which ate the offerings on the altar was slain, the murderer fled, and the axe with which the deed was done was tried, found guilty, and cast into the sea. The skin of the ox was stuffed with grass and yoked to a plough, while the flesh was 'sacramentally' consumed by the worshippers. Here is perhaps a trace of the divine animal; but in the majority of cases of alleged animal-worship our earliest records show the animal associated with an anthropomorphic deity, as a form in which he may upon occasion manifest himself, and it seems very doubtful to the present writer whether there are adequate grounds for postulating a stage in Greek religion in which gods were not yet conceived in terms of human personality and animals were the objects of direct worship.

In historical times the influences moulding development were pre-eminently anthropomorphic. Only in Orphism and the worship of Dionysus do the animal manifestations of the divine assume a real importance. Here the development is analogous to that in the hybrid cults of the Gnostics. The strange combination of the bestial and the divine is regarded as a symbolic mystery challenging the worshipper to seek for esoteric meanings (cf. vol. I, p. 203). The vestiges of animism may perhaps be traced in the worship of Earth, in such cult-titles as Demeter Chloē (Verdure) or Zeus Keraunos (Thunderbolt), and in magical sacrifices to the winds. Survivals of fertility magic are to be observed in such ceremonies as the scattering over the fields of the decomposed remains of the pigs offered at the *Thargēlia*, or in the sham fight of which the Argive *Lithobolia* is perhaps a survival. Obscene ribaldry continued to maintain its place in ritual as a means of promoting fertility or of averting the evil eye. Traces of polydaemonism may be found in the worship of functional powers analogous to the Roman *numina*. These can be detected by their names which indicate their function, like those of the heroes Eunostos 'Good Harvest,' or Echetlos 'Plough-handle,' or denote a group of spirits which are not individualized, such as *θεαὶ Γενετυλλίδες* 'goddesses of child-birth,' or *θεοὶ Ἀποτροπαῖοι* 'gods who avert evil.' In Greek religion, as in other religions, primitive elements survived or left their mark upon ritual. It is, however, a mistake to exaggerate their importance, for ritual survivals have often but little meaning for later worshippers, as could be easily illustrated at the present day.

V. HOMERIC RELIGION

The Homeric poems (see chap. xviii) present a picture of heroic society, whose religious beliefs are lofty in tone, genial and unbarbaric in their expression, and profoundly capable of ethical and social development (see p. 485 *sq.*). But the religious beliefs and practices of the age are incidental only to the theme of the bards, and no conclusions can be drawn from silence upon matters which there may have been no call to mention. More perplexing than the omissions is a real inconsistency between the more primitive elements in Greek religion and the general lofty character of Homeric religious thought. It is hazardous, however, to do more than register the discrepancy. To explain it satisfactorily is impossible because our knowledge of racial facts and factors is too scanty to provide working hypotheses which will stand the test of general application.

By the time of Homer the Greek pantheon had taken shape. It is true that some universal cults had not yet achieved their subsequent popularity. Dionysus had entered Greece, but his cult had not yet attained its later expansion and importance. Asclepius was but an unimportant local deity; in fact, the universal popularity of his cult as the god of healing is a modern religious movement in the fifth century B.C., and arouses the conservative prejudice of Aristophanes. Pan, who first emerged from the obscurity of local cult with his adoption by the Athenian state after Marathon, was as yet but an Arcadian shepherd god. But the principal figures of the Greek pantheon have already their homes upon Olympus; Zeus is established at Dodona and Apollo at Delphi.

The gods are now sharply individualized and their various functions or provinces are assigned to them. Zeus, the father of gods and men, is paramount in virtue of his superior might, though his authority is sometimes challenged by individual gods and the distinctions of province are not invariably observed. The gods are conceived as omnipotent and omniscient. The limitation of their power by an impersonal Fate arises partly no doubt from anthropomorphism, as, for example, in a passage where Zeus grieves for the inevitable doom of his mortal son. But the conception of an inexorable Destiny, which in some passages coincides with the will of Zeus, is by no means consistently presented, nor can it be made to give a monotheistic character to a system which is frankly polytheistic. At most it represents a tendency towards a system of unification similar to that which finds expression in the supremacy of Zeus over the other gods. The Homeric gods

'love not froward deeds but they reverence justice and the righteous acts of men.' They promote and foster the arts of civilization and progress, and they maintain the sanctity of the oath. They protect the weak and the suppliant, and Zeus' daughters, the Prayers which follow after Sin, grant blessings to the merciful man; but when one denieth them they make prayer to Zeus that sin may come upon him, that he may fall and pay the price.

A sanction was given to the practice of mercy towards the helpless, not only by the sharp reversals of fortune of an age of warfare, in which the chieftain of one day is fully conscious that he may be a beggar and outcast on the next, but also by the belief that gods themselves visited the earth in humble guise, and an affront offered to a beggar might prove in fact a direct offence against a god in person. A lofty standard of conduct, of which the guardians were *Aidōs* and *Nemesis*, the shame of a man's conscience and the righteous indignation of public opinion, is set by the Homeric gods; and when the philosophers criticize the shortcomings of these idealized human beings, they yet owe to them in large measure their point of vantage, the axiom that God is good. It is true that the standard of conduct upon Olympus seems often to fall below that required of mortals; and gods are guilty of such dastardly deceits as that by which Athena lured Hector to his doom. This anomaly is largely due to the belief in the divine causation of all phenomena coupled with the absence of a personification of Evil. There is no ready solution to the problem of evil such as that which the Devil can supply. Already in Homer the problem is stated in the complaint of Philoetius: 'Father Zeus, none other god is more baneful than thou; thou hast no compassion on men that are of thine own begetting, but makest them to have fellowship with evil and with bitter pains.' And in an interesting passage Zeus attempts to shift the blame from Heaven: 'Lo you now, how vainly mortal men do blame the gods! For of us they say comes evil, whereas they even of themselves, through the blindness of their own hearts, have sorrows beyond that which is ordained.'

Turning to the externals of worship, in the Homeric age the aniconic image is giving place to the statue, and idolatry is beginning. To the gods are allotted demesnes, and shrines are erected in their honour by chieftains who wish to earn their favour. There are established temples, and gods and goddesses have often their favourite seat of worship. The existence of temples and cult centres implies their maintenance by professional

priests; and, besides the prophet who accompanies the army in war, there are the Selloi, who declare the oracles of Zeus at Dodona, priests of the temples of Apollo and Hephaestus in the Troad, and even warrior priests of deities (*e.g.* Scamander) who have no temples.

The priest, however, was and remained a religious functionary of secondary importance. The individual can approach the gods directly without priestly mediation, and the proper channel for national worship is not sacerdotal but royal. The *basileus*, the secular head of the community, is also its religious head. The Mycenaean palace-shrines suggest that this was true of the pre-Hellenic period, and it seems probable that the earliest citadels, round which the city-states grew up, were crowned with a combined palace and temple. The secular control of state religion remained the rule for the historic period. There are signs of friction between Agamemnon and Calchas in the *Iliad*, and Nestor's question to Telemachus in the *Odyssey* has been interpreted by some scholars as referring to the interference of an oracle in politics: 'Say, dost thou willingly submit thee to oppression, or do the people throughout the land hate thee, obedient to the voice of a god?' But if the priesthood made a bid for political power it failed. In Greece the head of the state controlled national worship in virtue of his secular position, and the professional priest remained politically unimportant.

Sacrifice in the Homeric poems is mainly conceived as an offering to the gods to earn their gratitude or to turn away their wrath—a system of bargaining, as Plato indignantly declares. But there are deeper religious ideas implicit in Homeric ritual. The sacrifice is a feast in which god and worshippers share in a tribal communion-meal, and the more mystic conception of sacrament is not wholly absent. The ox was consecrated by the barley stalks from the altar, and thereby sanctified by contact with its immanent holiness; and the feast was preluded by the ritual tasting of the entrails of the victim, an act which made the worshippers direct participants in the life of the hallowed victim.

Homeric eschatology raises the question of hero worship and the cult of the dead. Though the majority of the hero-cults of classical Greece are post-Homeric, there must have been a continuous tradition of the worship of the dead from Mycenaean times, for the practice was firmly rooted among the Mediterranean peoples. That the northerners who cremated their dead paid them worship seems improbable. The cults of Heracles, Menelaus and Helen, and Ino-Leucothea were known to the author of

the *Odyssey*; the *Iliad* contains no reference to hero-worship and no traces of a cult of the dead. Funeral ceremonies, it is true, are necessary and may be elaborate; those for Patroclus are fully described. Victims were burned on the pyre with the body, and horses, dogs and twelve Trojan captives were killed to bear the dead man company. The charred bones were picked out, when the embers had been quenched with wine, and were put into a golden urn, over which a round barrow was heaped, and a pillar planted upon the top. Funeral games might be held in honour of the dead, and their barrows remained landmarks for posterity like the barrow of Aepytus in Arcadia, or that of Ilus on the plain of Troy; but Homer does not indicate the performance of any cult at these monuments which were erected, as he states explicitly, to keep alive the secular memory of fallen chieftains. If deprived of his rites of burial, the dead man remained a miserable outlaw in the next world; when they had been duly performed he passed into the halls of Hades, the nether Zeus, and his queen Persephone.

In the *Odyssey* the promise is made to Menelaus that he shall be 'translated' to the Elysian Plain at the world's end. This is the first literary reference to the belief in a western Paradise reserved for the semi-divine heroes, who do not suffer death, which reappears in Hesiod's Isles of the Blessed. The home of the dead was located beneath the earth, though its gateway appears to lie at the western rim of Ocean, which surrounds the world. The *Iliad* contains indication that the perjured were punished after death by the Erinyes, who dwell below the earth, and are aroused by beating on the ground with invocation of the powers of the underworld. These Erinyes seem to be personifications of the power of the curse rather than themselves spirits of the dead. In the Hades visited by Odysseus, though certain semi-divine personages who have been guilty of aggravated sacrilege receive perpetual punishment, there is no torture-chamber for ordinary mortals.

The future life is conceived in terms of gloomy unreality. The strengthless dead pursue a phantom existence on the model of their earthly lives. They are represented as unsubstantial parodies of living men, unable to speak until the warm blood of the offerings has tinged them with a borrowed life. The famous answer of Achilles to the consolation attempted by Odysseus is explicit: 'Nay, speak not comfortably to me of death, oh great Odysseus! Rather would I live on ground as the hireling of another, with a landless man who had no great livelihood, than

bear sway among all the dead that be departed.' And yet, in spite of this picture of ghostly nonentity, it can hardly be doubted that the poet had visited the mantic shrine of a hero, for the rites of invocation which he describes cannot be imaginary but are clearly based upon the observation of an actual cult.

Perhaps the most probable explanation is that cults of the dead existed in Greece continuously from Mycenaean times, but that such practices were originally alien to the northerners and were only gradually adopted by them. The tribal organization of society with its natural bias towards ancestor-cults may have assisted this adoption. In historical Greece both nations and clans paid cult to divine ancestors: the Arcadians worshipped Arcas, the Philaids Aeacus, and the Eurysacidae Ajax. In fact, even when locality is substituted for kinship as the basis of political society, a hero of the deme takes the place of the family hero, and the common folk invent a patron ancestor of their trade like the hero Keramos of the potters.

It is certain, in any case, that from the eighth century onwards hero-cults spread all over Greece and the movement was supported and encouraged by the Delphic oracle. Actually many of the heroes worshipped in historical times may have been the faded gods of local cults, like Trophonius; some were the traditional heroes of saga like Achilles, but all were conceived by their worshippers as having been mortal men canonized after their death. The next step, the apotheosis of great men of the nearer past, was promoted by colonization. The very intelligible procedure of adopting the founder of a colony as its patron hero led to the speedy deification of historical personages. Hence arises the possibility of Amphipolis worshipping the Spartan general Brasidas immediately after his death, and in due time the living lay claim to divine honours. This last infirmity however did not befall Greek religion until the time of Alexander and his successors, and oriental influences are in part responsible.

Whatever may be true of the people of the Bronze Age, the Greeks were never a ghost-ridden people. *Δεισιδαιμονία* (the fear of spirits) for the Greek is a term of reproach, and if the angry *Kēr*, or spirit of the dead, passed into folklore, it has left little mark upon religion or cult. Heroes were sometimes dangerous powers; but on the whole they were beneficent, and their anger was usually reserved for the descendants of their personal enemies, evil-doers, or the enemies of the state which paid their worship. To their worshippers they brought good. Sparta was eager to possess herself of the bones of Orestes, and Athens of the relics

of Oedipus or Theseus. Nor, so far as they appear in public cult, do the spirits of the less distinguished dead play a very terrifying part. The third day of the *Anthesiēria* at Athens was the day of All Souls. The ancestral spirits revisited their homes and partook of the porridge prepared for them by their descendants, and at the end of the day were peaceably dismissed by a simple formula to their own place. Though in all times and places the horror of death has made the ghost an object of individual dread, Greek public cult was little affected by such fears, and it was left to Orphism to stress the terrors of the underworld.

VI. THE OLYMPIAN GODS

Zeus, the father of gods and men, is depicted by Homer as the overlord of the other gods, who may upon occasion protest at the exercise of his authority but are in practice powerless to dispute it. In one passage Poseidon, resentful of his brother's interference, declares that the three sons of Cronos cast lots to determine their spheres of influence, the sky fell to Zeus, the sea to Poseidon, and the underworld to Hades. But in cult, as in Homer, Zeus encroached upon the spheres of his brothers; we hear of a cult of Zeus Enalios (Zeus of the Sea), and Hades was often regarded as an aspect of Zeus rather than as an independent personality. Both in literature and cult Zeus was conceived primarily as a sky-god, the wielder of the thunder and the giver of rain, who dwells upon the mountain top, and the holy places of his cult were frequently situated upon the summits of mountains. The oak, in Greece as in Italy, was peculiarly sacred to the thunder-god, and from the sacred oak of Zeus at Dodona in Epirus oracles were being given in the time of Homer. This oracle, the foundation of which must belong to the earliest period of Indo-European immigration, was in existence throughout Greek history, but after the heroic age it was overshadowed by the growing repute and importance of the oracle of Apollo at Delphi.

Although the conception of a god, who is above all other gods, contains obvious possibilities of monotheistic development, the trend of Greek religious evolution, as we have already noticed, was in the opposite direction. But the fact that all Greek-speaking peoples recognized the sovereignty of Zeus made him a force on the side of the principle of national unity against particularism. This tendency may be seen in the worship of Zeus Pan-Hellenios, and in the common sacrifice of gratitude for deliverance in the Persian war, which was made by the patriot Greeks to Zeus the

god of Freedom (Eleutherios). The earliest and most important of the great Pan-Hellenic religious festivals was that at which the whole Greek world met in harmony to celebrate the Olympic Games.

The fatherhood of Zeus implied a moral or spiritual rather than a physical tie with his worshippers. Zeus Patrōs is concerned with the rights and duties of fatherhood and to Zeus, the god of fathers, the outraged parent in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes appeals. Zeus and Hera were the guardians of marriage, Zeus of the Family Hearth (Herkeios) sanctioned the rights and obligations of all within the family tie, and Zeus Ktēsios was god of the family property. The larger social units were similarly under the protection of Zeus, as is shown by such titles as Zeus of the Brotherhood (Phratrios), or Zeus of the City (Polieus). It was from Zeus that the Homeric king had held his authority, the power of pronouncing 'judgments' (θέμιστες) and its symbol, the sceptre. The god of social institutions had naturally a place in political life. The members of the Council at Athens prayed to Zeus Boulaios; in the market stood Zeus of the Meeting-Place (Agoraios).

In the early development of moral progress the worship of Zeus played an important part. Already in Homer Zeus, the father of all men, was regarded as the warden of the rights of hospitality. Zeus Xenios, the god of the stranger, protected the guest, the suppliant, and the helpless, and secured equitable treatment for those who were outside the ties of kinship and were consequently, in strict tribal law, destitute of rights. In another sphere the god no less promoted the cause of international fair dealing; the thunderbolts of Zeus Horkios were believed to blast the perjurer and provided a sanction for the oath. Zeus the Kindly (Meilichios), an euphemistic title belonging to the god, who in this underworld aspect was often represented in snake-form, may originally have been a vegetation deity of death and resurrection. One of his early functions, however, was the punishment of the shedding of kindred blood, which, in contradistinction to the killing of the alien, a purely secular matter in Homer and capable of secular adjustment, was held to bring religious pollution upon the community. From this function Zeus developed the qualities of a god of supplication, cleansing, and purification, and his cults under these aspects notably assisted the growth of the ideas of reconciliation and forgiveness of sins.

Hera, the sister and wife of Zeus, plays in mythology the rôle of the jealous wife of uncertain temper, justifiably incensed by the

numerous intrigues of her husband with mortal women. The most important centres of her cult were at Argos and Samos, at both of which places her worship became assimilated with a pre-existing cult of the nature goddess of the Bronze Age. Of these two states she was the patron deity; elsewhere her cult, though universally honoured, was not of the first political importance. The chief function of Hera was the protection of the sanctity of the marriage tie. Her marriage with Zeus, which in many of her cults was dramatically represented, was regarded as the divine counterpart or example of the human institution. Her help, like that of other goddesses, was invoked to assist women in travail.

Poseidon, the brother of Zeus, was revered throughout the Greek world as the god of the sea, the earth-shaker, whose trident roused the earthquake, and the god of horses. Mythology appropriately attributed to the ruler of the raging sea the paternity of monsters of gigantic strength and violence. Fresh water, as well as salt, came under his jurisdiction, and indeed it is probable that he was originally the water-god of an inland people, who took first to the sea when his worshippers reached the coasts of the Aegean. As the god of fresh water Poseidon was connected with fertility, which perhaps accounts for his frequent association with Demeter in local cults. The view that Poseidon was originally an earth-god is not supported by what is known of his cult. The association of the god with the bull is also to be attributed to his character as a god of water, for the conception of the water-spirit as a bull recurs frequently in European folk-lore.

It seems probable that Thessaly and Boeotia were the early centres of the worship of Poseidon from which it spread with the migration of its adherents. Particularly close is the connection of this god with the Minyans of the Pagasean Gulf and with the Ionians. The great centre of his worship in Greece proper during historical times was Corinth, the second home of Jason; abroad, the most powerful league of Greek colonial states, that of the Ionians of Asia Minor, was united by the common worship of Poseidon Helicōnius, a title in all probability carried across the Aegean from Boeotia by the original Ionian settlers. There was also a very early political league of states belonging to the north-eastern Peloponnese and central Greece which met at the temple of Poseidon at Calauria. Unlike Zeus, Poseidon plays no part in connection with the social structure of Greek communities in general. A racial or a tribal loyalty seems to hang about him, and where he was worshipped as God of the Brotherhood (*Phratrios*) or the Father (*Patēr*) it is in connection with specific clans. Under

the former title he was worshipped by the Labyadae at Delphi, under the latter by the Eumolpidae of Eleusis.

Apollo, the god of prophecy, was the patron of music and art, the founder of cities and the framer of laws. To his character as a prophet he probably owed his artistic qualities and his powers of healing. In all primitive societies the song or chant is the natural vehicle for prophecy and spell, while medicine in its earlier stages is magical or religious in its methods rather than empirical or scientific. Apollo, the father of Asclepius, was a god of healing before the latter became the object of more than local cult; and from the earliest times he was the god of purification. On the other hand, his general pre-eminence as the framer of constitutions and religious ordinances must be directly attributed to the momentous establishment of the Delphic cult and the great political importance which it attained.

Graeco-Roman mythology regarded Apóllo as a solar deity, and this conception has in consequence implanted itself firmly in European literary tradition no less than in the popular mind. But in fact Homer, Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymn alike are silent as to the solar association of the god, and the first certain reference to it in literature occurs in the fragment of a lost play of Euripides. The title Lycius, it is true, is undeniably early, for there can be little doubt that Lycia owes its name to Lycian Apollo, who crossed the Aegean with the earliest waves of Hellenic settlement in Asia. But modern philology has rejected the once popular view that this epithet can be derived from a root meaning 'light,' and mythology and etymology alike support the view that Apollo Lycius was originally a wolf-god. There remains the epithet Phoebus, which is constantly attached to Apollo in the Homeric poems. Indubitably the word must mean 'radiant' or 'shining'; but such an epithet, if unsupported by other evidence, is hardly sufficient by itself to identify Apollo with the sun. In fact, it is probable that the solar aspect of Apollo is not original at all, but is the result of attempts to explain religious legend in terms of natural phenomena, which, as we have seen, were of common occurrence in antiquity. In Roman times the influence of Stoicism, combined with the popularity of solar cults of eastern origin, led to an actual identification in cult of Apollo with Hēlios, but this development cannot affect the question of the god's original character.

Unique in Greek religious practice were the pilgrimages by which sacred offerings were sent to Apollo at Delphi and Delos, and their traditional routes very probably preserve two lines of

prehistoric invasion. The one led from Tempe along the Sacred Way to Delphi, the road which was traversed every nine years by the youth who impersonated the god returning after purification from the blood of Python. The other passed down the Adriatic to Dodona, thence crossed Greece overland to the Malian Gulf, ran down Euboea to Carystus, and from there by Tenos to the Delian shrine. Apollo of the Ways (Aguieus), whom the ill-fated Cassandra invokes in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, was probably the god who led the prehistoric wanderings of his people. In historical times the god of migrations had become the god of streets, and his sacred cone stood in front of all buildings, whether public or private.

Of the two great centres of Apolline worship Delos claimed to be the birthplace of the god; but Homer, who knew of the Delphic temple, does not mention the Delian, and the primitive tribal organization of the Delphic Amphictyony confirms the great antiquity of Delphi. Of the two cults the Delian was probably later. The island, however, was early a religious centre for the Ionians of the Cyclades, a fact which Pisistratus, and after him imperial Athens, were to turn to political advantage. In the Peloponnese the Dryopian tribes seem to have planted the worship of Apollo before the Dorian conquest, but he was regarded as peculiarly the god of the Dorians. Many of his legends are connected with the Dorian invasion; in Greece Apollo Pythius was the chief political deity of Dorian Sparta, and in Asia Minor the league of the Dorian Hexapolis met at the shrine of Apollo Triopios.

Primitive elements are to be noticed in the early conceptions of Apollo. He was the hunter-god, whose attribute was the bow, and the god of woods and caves; the wolf-god has already been mentioned. Legend and cult alike testify to his pastoral aspect; he was connected also with the growth of vegetation: the laurel, the plane and the tamarisk being peculiarly his trees. The pastoral god became also the god of corn (Sitalcas), and the feast of Carnean Apollo, who was originally a shepherd-god, was in historical times a harvest festival of late summer. To Apollo the farmer prayed to avert vermin or blight from his crops, as is shown by such cult titles as Locust (Parnopios) or Mildew (Erythibios).

As the Youth (Kouros) or Nurturer of Youths (Kourotrophos) Apollo was the guardian of young male life. In Athens at least he was an ancestral god (Patrōos), connected with the gentile structure of the community. It was natural that the god who

guided Greek colonization should become a sea-farer: Apollo was worshipped as the Island God (Nāsiōtās), and as the Dolphin God (Delphinios) guided the ships of his settlers. This latter title seems to have originated in Crete whence it passed into mainland Greece, a return wave, as it were, of Apolline expansion. The cults of Apollo as the Leader (Hēgemōn) or the Founder (Ktistes) are the natural products of the connection of Delphi with Greek colonization. This great topic, however, belongs more properly to a later chapter of this history, as does also the influence of Delphi upon the political and moral thought of Greece.

Artemis, the sister of Apollo, is portrayed by Homer as the chaste huntress and leader of the nymphs, the goddess who sends a gentle death to women. Her cult, however, reveals the very different characteristics of a deity of lakes and rivers, the goddess of all wild things, unwedded but not virginal, the helper of women in travail. Her worship as goddess of the wilds has affinities with the religion of the Bronze Age, and she was the Greek successor of the goddess depicted upon Aegean works of art. This character rendered Artemis peculiarly susceptible to identification with foreign goddesses, *e.g.* with Thracian Bendis, or with the fertility goddess Ephesus. Indeed, upon the eastern fringe of the Greek world many deities were worshipped under the name of Artemis whose characters and cults were almost purely Semitic or oriental.

The legends of a number of the mortal heroines connected with Artemis in mythology, such as Callisto, the ancestress of the Arcadians, or Britomartis-Dictynna of Crete, are thought to preserve the memory of local cults and names of the goddess, which in some cases may have survived from the Bronze Age. Among local cults the very early worship of Artemis Braurōnia in Attica, the goddess in whose honour all Athenian maidens danced the bear-dance before marriage, is connected with the Tauric Artemis, who probably owes her name not to the Tauric Chersonese but rather to the cult of Artemis in bull form. The story of Iphigenia has given literary fame to the traditions of savagery and human sacrifice which hang about this cult.

Homer is as ignorant of a lunar Artemis as of a solar Apollo, nor is there any evidence that Artemis was identified with the moon before the fifth century B.C. Hecate, whom a fragment of Hesiod already connects with Artemis, if not originally lunar came early to be so regarded. This foreign, perhaps Thracian, goddess was unknown to Homer. She was a power of the underworld, and the queen of magic to whom sacrifice of dogs was made at midnight at the cross-roads. In historical times the per-

sonalities of Artemis and Hecate tended to become assimilated and the latter was regarded as an aspect of Artemis rather than as an independent personality.

Athena, the grey-eyed warrior-maid, who was born fully armed from the head of Zeus, the lady of wise counsel, the patron of skilled handicraft, is already in Homer the chief power among the Olympians after her father, and the most redoubtable champion of the Greek cause at Troy. In the primitive story of her birth her mother was Mētis (Wisdom), whom Zeus swallowed while she was pregnant, and intelligence is throughout the quality which above all others guides Athena's activities. The worship of Athena was of immemorial antiquity in Attica, for the legend of her struggle with Poseidon almost certainly represents the unsuccessful attempt of a later immigrant tribe to wrest the sovereignty from the children of Athena. Her cult both in Athens and elsewhere retained vestiges of a primitive aspect of the goddess, and in a few cases ritual or legendary survivals of human sacrifice in her honour. Her association in Attic cult with the Earth goddess, her festivals connected with sowing and vintage, and her gift of the olive point to her early character of an agricultural goddess. The obscure Homeric epithet 'Tritogenia' seems to denote a goddess of water, and may have had its first home in Boeotia, where Athena, 'Who Gives Help in Battle,' gave its name to Alalcomenae.

The conception of Athena as a goddess of war is very early. Upon the security of her image, Palladium, the safety of beleaguered states was thought to depend. Yet Athena never represented, like Ares, the fury of battle, but rather disciplined and intelligent civic courage. Athenian brides were consecrated to Athena before marriage, and the goddess in Athens and elsewhere was worshipped under the titles of Phratría and Apatúria, the latter an epithet derived from the great gentile festival of the Ionian race. The goddess of wisdom was Boulaia, and in other states as well as Athens was worshipped as Polias, the Guardian of the City.

Of Athens she was of course the pre-eminent deity, and the contribution of her people to civilization was worthy of the goddess of intelligence and the arts. Already in Homer she inspired skilled handicraft, and in historical times weavers, potters, and metal-workers found in her a patron. In music she was credited with the invention of the flute; recitations and musical performances found a place in the celebration of the great imperial festival held by the Athenians in her honour. Her native character

and the acknowledged position of Athens as the School of Hellas combined to make her the representative of science and philosophy.

Demeter, the goddess of agriculture and fruitfulness, as her name implies, was originally a form of the Earth Mother and with *Gē* she shared cult titles such as *Anesidōra*, 'She who sends up gifts,' or *Karpophoros*, 'Fruit bearing.' The Earth Mother has naturally an underworld aspect; Demeter was worshipped as Chthonian and in the legends of some Greek cults she was the consort of the god of the nether regions. An important but obscure cult title *Thesmophoros*, from which the Attic festival of the *Thesmophoria* took its name, was a source of difficulty to the ancients who interpreted it, though probably wrongly, to mean either the giver of the settled institutions of civilization or alternatively the giver of the ordinances of marriage. Neither of these explanations tally with the character of the *Thesmophoria*, which was a woman's autumn festival, the ritual of which included a descent to and an ascent from underground chambers, and various magical ceremonies intended to promote the fertility of the land and its inhabitants. But, whatever the original meaning of the word, the explanations current in antiquity reacted upon the popular conception of the goddess.

With Demeter was associated the figure of *Korē*, the Maiden, who was also known as *Persephone*. The myth told how *Persephone*, the daughter of *Zeus* and *Demeter*, was abducted while gathering flowers by *Pluto*, the god of the nether world. For long the sorrowing mother sought her daughter in vain, but at length the arrangement was made that *Persephone* should remain for part of the year with her husband in the realm of the dead, and return each year for spring and summer to comfort her mother. This story formed the plot of a ritual drama of the death of nature in winter and her resurrection in spring, which was enacted at the *Mysteries*. *Homer* mentions *Demeter* and he knew of *Persephone* as the queen of the underworld, but he does not bring the two figures into essential connection. The title *Korē*, by which the younger deity was usually known in cult, appears first in *Hesiod*. It is possible that *Korē* was a figure originally derived from the worship of *Demeter Korē*, *i.e.* *Demeter* in a youthful aspect, that the cult title became an independent figure, and subsequently became identified with *Persephone*, the Queen of *Hades*. But that *Homer* did not happen to mention the story of the rape is not conclusive evidence that it originated in post-Homeric times. Its prominence in the drama of ritual suggests, on the contrary,

that it must have been a very early feature of the worship of Demeter.

Hermes, the messenger of Homeric Olympus, belongs to Arcadia, where his traditional birthplace was located on Mount Cyllene. His primary character was that of the shepherd god, and in many places the nymphs were associated with his worship. The male organ of generation was his symbol as the deity of fertility and increase; he was worshipped under the name Phales and in some cults was connected with Aphrodite. Although he plays no part in any mystery cult, Hermes like other primitive deities of fertility had an underworld aspect and was worshipped as Chthonian. Homer has described how the souls of the dying fare with Hermes Psychopompos to the abode of the dead, and in popular Greek practice the image of Hermes was placed in the bed-room to avert the dangers attendant upon Death's twin sister Sleep.

The most primitive and most familiar form of the cult image of Hermes was the pillar or pile of stones erected, in the first place, at the boundaries of property or at cross-roads. The function of the boundary-god was appropriately combined with the promotion of the fertility of the farm which he guarded. The god of the cross-ways may owe his position to the ghostly terrors associated with such localities, from which Hermes, the leader of souls, was able to deliver the passer-by. Owing, probably, to this worship at the cross-roads Hermes became the god of wayfarers and the protector of heralds, whose wand of office was an attribute of the god. Further, as god of journeying Hermes became the god of luck, commerce and gain, and, like the mediaeval St Nicholas, the patron of 'gentlemen of the road.'

There is a similarity between some aspects of Hermes and Apollo. Both were originally pastoral deities, the images of both were set up along the roads, and both under the conditions of city life became the gods of streets. The Homeric Hymn ascribes the invention of the lyre to Hermes, and narrates how he stole the cattle of Apollo. Like Apollo, Hermes was *Kourotrophos*, and in this aspect contributed to the development of athletics. He was the patron of gymnastics and his image stood in every palaestra; his festivals, like those of the greater saints in the tradition of our older public schools, provided the schoolboy with a whole holiday.

Hephaestus, the lame smith, the god of metal-working and handicraft, was a more prominent figure in mythology than in cult. His lameness was ascribed to his fall from Heaven, whence he was hurled by Zeus or Hera. His name is probably non-

Hellenic and he cuts a boorish figure among the other Homeric gods. His ill-assorted marriage with Aphrodite provided the comic relief upon Olympus. Lemnos, the site of his fall, was the chief seat of his worship; at Athens also his cult was of great antiquity. Here he was associated with Athena, the goddess of handicraft, was worshipped as the patron of metal workers, and was honoured by a torch race festival.

Ares, the god of war, was never quite at home in Greek life. Homer, who attributes to him a marked partiality for the Trojans, considered Ares to be a Thracian, regarded him with aversion, and upon occasion treated him with disrespect. He remained the god of the Berserker fury and brutality of battle, and though his divinity was recognized throughout the states of Greece he never assimilated the spirit of Hellenic civilization. In historical times his cult had little importance, and he played no part in the social, moral, or political development of the Greek race.

Aphrodite, the goddess of love, the wife of Hephaestus and the paramour of Ares, is also treated by Homer with but little respect, and is represented as pro-Trojan in her sympathies. Her favourite seat of worship was in semi-oriental Cyprus, the island in which the Aegean culture lingered late. Cythera, whence she derived the epithet *Cytherēa* so familiar to readers of the Latin poets, was a very ancient home of the goddess. It is possible that Homer, who spoke in the *Iliad* of 'divine Cythera,' made allusion to the cult: it had certainly achieved fame and importance before the time of Hesiod. Crete, where flourishing cults of Aphrodite existed in historical times, also laid claim to be the aboriginal centre from which her worship had spread to other parts of the Mediterranean. Further, the cults of Aphrodite in the Cyclades, in Argos, in Attica, and elsewhere upon the shores of the Saronic Gulf, are closely associated with the story of Theseus and Ariadne. The geographical distribution of this association of cult and legend had been recognized as important before the discoveries at Cnossus revealed its full significance. The patently un-Hellenic character of the goddess and her cult was then ascribed to Phoenician influence; but, on the evidence of the archaeological discoveries in Crete, it is now more probably attributed to survival from that Bronze Age religion from which the Semites themselves may have derived their goddess-cults. Aphrodite was the goddess of love in all its aspects, including that of mere sexual gratification. She resembled Artemis in her susceptibility to oriental influences, and was, in a sense, sponsor for the introduction into Greece of the oriental vegetation-cult of the dying Adonis.

VII. POLITICAL ASPECTS OF GREEK RELIGION

The most important religious movement in post-Homeric Greece was the spread of the worship of Dionysus and the complementary development of Orphism. Dionysiac worship was orgiastic in character, and it was universal in its scope rather than particularist or national. The mystery-cults, which without exception were connected with Chthonian deities, were also concerned with the individual soul and its fate in a future existence, and as such their appeal was not restricted to members of a single political or national organization.

Alike in this interest in the future life of the individual and in the universality of their appeal, the mystery-cults differed from the rest of Greek religion. For, as a whole, Greek religion is primarily concerned with man as a political or social being. From the very beginning religious ties formed the essential structure of society: the duties which religion enjoined or sanctioned were the duties of a member of a social unit, whether clan, tribe, or state; the gift which it bestowed upon Greek civilization was primarily the guidance of a high development of family morality, civic patriotism, law, and public life. Indeed Greek civilization in all its aspects was intensely political, and even for the philosophers ethics remained but a subsection of politics. The individualistic tendency of the religions of the modern world, to which this whole attitude towards life is strange, is partly responsible for a common misapprehension as to the vitality and force of Greek polytheism. In fact, Greek religion permeated every action or relation of the individual towards other members of society. There is no branch of Greek literature, hardly indeed a surviving individual work, which does not throw light upon religious belief and practice. The speeches of the Attic orators, unlike those recorded in our Hansard, are full of religious reference, for the simple reason that here, as among other early peoples, it was impossible to touch at any point the life of the individual in society without religion becoming involved (compare above, pp. 343; and vol. I, pp. 197 *sqq.*, 211 *sqq.*).

The political history of Greece is marked by intense particularism, the defect accompanying that ideal of freedom in a free community which was built up by the city-states. On the other hand, the greater part of Greek history is a chronicle of the unsuccessful attempts to create a larger political unit than the city-state, the impulse to which was in part imposed by political necessity, but in part arose from a common consciousness of race.

In Greek religion, intensely political in character, these two tendencies are also in evidence, the one working towards particularism, the other towards a wider Pan-Hellenic unity, and in religion as in politics the Greeks—like other ancient peoples—failed to solve the antinomy.

From the earliest times these two tendencies are to be observed. The invading Indo-Europeans were united in the worship of Zeus and others of the high gods whom they revered in common. At the same time their social organization was tribal, and the groups of kin were bound by family or tribal worships which were exclusive in character. Of this an illustration is provided by the arrangements in early Greece for giving civil protection to the 'impure by blood,' who, not being members of any clan, had consequently no rights in the community. Whereas in Rome the difficulty was met by the quasi-legal adoption of the *client* by the *patronus*, in Greece the adoption was religious. A status was conferred by admission to the family *orgia*, which could not indeed bestow the full membership of descent from a common mother, but brought the alien within the protection of the kin. The tie of religion was indeed as essential a factor in the social structure as the tie of blood. Thus Herodotus can indicate the genealogy of Isagoras by naming his family-cult, and one of his tests of a genuinely Ionian people is whether they keep the feast of the Apatūria; cf. above, p. 545.

It has been seen that participation in the family-rites brought the alien within the kin and made him a member of the community. Political union on a larger scale was effected by not dissimilar means. The *polis* itself grew up round the temple of a common worship, and Athens is but one of the many Greek city-states the names of which betray their origin in a common cult. In the same way participation in the common worship of 'the dwellers round' at some religious centre was the bond which held political federations or alliances of states together. Associations of this character go back to very early times, and among the earliest is that which became the Amphictyony of Delphi, the organization of which was evidently framed when the northern Greeks were still a collection of tribes. Through such political unions religion fostered the growth of international morality and a Pan-Hellenic consciousness of Greek civilization as a common heritage.

The institution which most nearly expressed the Pan-Hellenic ideal was the Delphic oracle, the central shrine of Greece, an arbiter of acknowledged authority in foreign affairs, and to some extent the guardian of the social and political conscience of the

Greeks. The political movement which contributed most towards its development was the establishment of tyranny as the prevailing form of government in the Greek states of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. The autocrat, as Aristotle acutely observed, had peculiar need of the support of the gods to justify a position which lacked the traditional sanctions of the heroic monarchy. The tyrants in consequence had a definite religious policy, and upon its negative side this policy was directed against the family and tribal cults, the control of which under the old social system had conferred upon the heads of the kin-groups the powerful weapon of the monopoly of religious law. Now the most effective line of attack upon these vested religious interests of the nobles, whose political power it was essential for the tyrant to destroy, was by promoting forms of worship, which were not bound up with the tribal system, at the expense of the family-cults. Hence the interest of rulers abetted the tendencies of the time, which manifested themselves in two directions, Pan-Hellenic and national. The religions of the common people, the worship of Dionysus, Orphism and the Eleusinian Mysteries seem notably to have gained ground. Pan-Hellenic cults and religious institutions were encouraged. The tyrants were generous givers to the Delphic god and notable supporters of the great Pan-Hellenic Games, the origin of which is obscure and disputed, but which attained their maximum splendour and popularity in the sixth century.

But although in some respects the religious policy of the tyrants made for Pan-Hellenic unity, in others it fostered particularist tendencies. Again, political exigencies were in part responsible. Autocracy can only justify its existence by success, and the fostering of national consciousness and national patriotism was an inevitable feature of its establishment. Religion like art or foreign politics may provide a means, nor was Henry VIII the first monarch to turn the national sentiment in religious matters to political account. Thus Pisistratus returned triumphantly from exile accompanied by a woman of more than ordinary stature robed as Athena; and to his reign belongs the establishment of the Great Panathenaea, the national, afterwards the imperial, festival of the goddess of the city. Her worship struck a profoundly patriotic note, and the frieze of the Parthenon preserves to-day the pomp and magnificence of the great procession in her honour. For Pericles, the second Pisistratus, Athena signified the personification of the Athens of his dreams.

It is sometimes suggested that the state-cults became the mere

formal expression of secular patriotism, that they had lost their vitality, and that Greek polytheism had ceased to count for much by the close of the fifth century B.C. Such assertions should, however, be received with caution. It is true that the failure of physical science to solve incontrovertibly the problems of Being and Knowledge had resulted in a wave of scepticism or pragmatism amongst the intellectuals, and that anthropological speculation and the influence of intelligent travellers had suggested philosophic doubts. Changes, too, were affecting the classes at the other end of the social scale. The hardships of prolonged war accentuated the appeal of religious emotionalism which found satisfaction in the alien cults which were invading Greece through her cosmopolitan sea-ports, or in the lower forms of Orphism with their promise of a readjustment of values in a future life in which 'the saved,' in Plato's caustic phrase, will find their reward in an eternal drinking bout, while the uninitiated will be condemned to hard labour in the nethermost pit of Hades.

But this is only one side of the picture. The weakness of a polytheism, which made no intransigent claims for orthodoxy, proved here a source of strength, and new modes of worship did not oust the old. That popular opinion was still on the side of religious conservatism is shown by the incident of the mutilation of the Hermae, the charges against the Periclean circle, and the condemnation of Socrates. More positive evidence of vitality is to be found in the sincerity of the religious art of Phidias, while even in the fourth century the references of the orators and the attitude of the philosophers show the old religion to be a living thing. Its influence upon the development of civilization had been profound, beneficent, and sane. From Homeric times it had stood consistently for progress; it had fostered the arts of painting, sculpture, music, poetry, and drama; it had promoted the ideals of justice, law, and order, and had guided the development of political life. Nor does it wholly fail to meet the test of its influence upon the individual conduct of the ordinary man. The pious old Cephalus in Plato's *Republic* has lived, it is true, by works rather than by faith, but a long and well-spent life is an achievement which the modern philosopher, with Plato, may respect. And this kindly portrait of a type, which cannot have been uncommon, shows that piety did not vanish from Athens with the coming of Anaxagoras, and that the practice of the old religion, whatever the philosophical shortcomings of unthinking conventional observance, could and did provide the sanction for a life crowned with years and well doing.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Abh. | Abhandlungen. |
| Abh. K.M. | Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. |
| A.J.A. | American Journal of Archaeology. |
| A.J. Ph. | American Journal of Philology. |
| A.J.S.L. | American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. |
| Anc. Eg. | Ancient Egypt. |
| A.S.A.E. | Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte. |
| Ath. Mitt. | Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Athenische Abteilung. |
| B. z. Ass. | Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. |
| B.C.H. | Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique. |
| B.I.C. | Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale au Caire. |
| Bay. S.B. | Sitzungsberichte d. bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften. |
| Berl. S.B. | Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin. |
| Biblica | Biblica. Commentarii editi a Pontificio Instituto Biblico, Roma. |
| B.S.A. | Annual of the British School at Athens. |
| B.S.R. | Papers of the British School at Rome. |
| Bull. d. I. | Bullettino dell' Istituto. |
| C.A.H. | Cambridge Ancient History. |
| C.I.G. | Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. |
| C.I.L. | Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. |
| C.I.S. | Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. |
| C.J. | Classical Journal. |
| C.Q. | Classical Quarterly. |
| C.R. | Classical Review. |
| C.R. Ac. Inscr. | Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions. |
| D.B. | Dictionary of the Bible (J. Hastings, Edinburgh, 1898). |
| E. Bi. | Encyclopaedia Biblica. |
| E. Brit. | Encyclopaedia Britannica. Ed. XI. |
| E.H.R. | English Historical Review. |
| E.R.E. | Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. |
| Εφ. Ἀρχ. | Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική. |
| F.H.G. | C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. |
| G.G.A. | Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen. |
| Geogr. Z. | Geographische Zeitschrift. |
| Head H.N. | Head, Historia Numorum, 2nd Ed. 1912. |
| Herm. | Hermes. |
| I.G.F. | Indogermanische Forschungen. |
| .A.O.S. | Journal of the American Oriental Society. |
| .A. | Journal Asiatique. |
| .B.S. | Journal of Biblical Studies. |
| .D.A.I. | Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts. |
| .E.A. | Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. |
| .H.S. | Journal of Hellenic Studies. |
| .Man. E.O.S. | Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society. |
| .R.A.I. | Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute. |
| .R.A.S. | Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. |
| .R.S. | Journal of Roman Studies. |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| J.S.O.R. | Journal of the Society of Oriental Research. |
| K.A.H. | Keilinschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts. |
| Klio. | Klio (Beiträge zur alten Geschichte). |
| Liv. A.A. | Liverpool Annals of Archaeology. |
| M.B.B.A. | Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie. |
| M.D.O.G. | Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. |
| M.D.P.V. | Mitteilungen des deutschen Palästinavereins. |
| M.V.A.G. | Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft. |
| Mon. d. I. | Monumenti Antichi dell' Istituto. |
| N.J. Kl. Alt. | Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum. |
| N.J.P. | Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie. |
| N.S.A. | Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità (Atti d. r. Accad. dei Lincei). |
| Num. Chr. | Numismatic Chronicle. |
| Num. Z. | Numismatische Zeitschrift. |
| O.L.Z. | Orientalische Literaturzeitung. |
| P.E.F. | Palestine Exploration Fund. |
| Phil. | Philologus. |
| P.S.B.A. | Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. |
| P.W. | Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. |
| Πρ. | Πρακτικά. |
| Q.S. | Quarterly Statement(s). |
| Rec. Trav. | Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne. |
| Rev. A. | Revue archéologique. |
| Rev. Ass. | Revue d'Assyriologie. |
| Rev. Bib. | Revue biblique internationale. |
| Rev. Eg. | Revue égyptologique. |
| Rev. E.G. | Revue des études grecques. |
| Rev. H. | Revue historique. |
| Rev. N. | Revue numismatique. |
| Rh. Mus. | Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. |
| Riv. Fil. | Rivista di Filologia. |
| Riv. N.O. | Rivista nuova orientale. |
| Röm. Mitth. | Mitteilungen des deutschen arch. Inst., Römische Abteilung. |
| R.V. | Revised Version. |
| R.V. mg. | Revised Version margin. |
| S.B. | Sitzungsberichte. |
| Syria. | Syria: Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie. |
| T.S.B.A. | Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. |
| Wien S.B. | Sitzungsberichte d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien. |
| Wien St. | Wiener Studien. |
| W.Z.K.M. | Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. |
| Z.A. | Zeitschrift für Assyriologie. |
| Z. Aeg. | Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde. |
| Z.A.T.W.* | Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. |
| Z.D.M.G. | Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. |
| Z.D.P.V. | Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins. |
| Z.E. | Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. |
| Z.G. f. E. | Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde. |
| Z.N. | Zeitschrift für Numismatik. |

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

These bibliographies do not aim at completeness. They include modern and standard works, and, in particular, books utilized in the writing of the chapters. Many technical monographs, especially in journals, are omitted, but the works that are registered below will put the reader on their track.

Special works dealing with the history posterior to the period with which this volume deals (viz. 1580 to c. 1000 B.C.) are naturally held over for the later volumes.

For some general information on the bibliographical, cartographical and other literature, see vol. 1, p. 630.

N.B. Books in English and French are, unless otherwise specified, published at London and at Paris respectively.

CHAPTER I

THE PEOPLES OF ASIA MINOR¹

GENERAL HISTORY

Cavaignac, E. *Histoire de l'Antiquité*. I, 11 (pp. 239-55). 1919.

Hall, H. R. *The Ancient History of the Near East*. 5th ed. 1920.

Helmholtz's *World History*. Vol. iv. *The Mediterranean Nations*.

Maspero, Sir Gaston. *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient*. 6th ed. 1904.

— *The Struggle of the Nations*. 2nd ed. 1910.

Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*. I, 11. 4th ed. Berlin, 1921. (Especially pp. 687-758.)

GEOGRAPHY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Hamilton, W. J. *Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia*. 2 vols. 1842.

Hogarth, D. G. *Ionia and the East*. Oxford, 1909.

Perrot, G. and C. Chipiez. *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, tome iv, Livre vi, *Les Hétéens* (1887); tome v, Livre vii, *La Phrygie, La Mysie, La Bithynie et La Paphlagonie*; Livre viii, *La Lydie et La Carie*; Livre ix, *La Lycie* (1890). Translated.

Ramsay, Sir W. M. *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. 1890. See also bibliography of Ramsay's publications in *Anatolian Studies* presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay, edited by W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder, 1923, pp. xiii-xxviii.

Reclus, El. *Nouvelle Géographie universelle*, tome ix (*Asie antérieure*). 1884. English translation by E. Ravenstein.

Texier, C. *Description de l'Asie Mineure*. 3 vols. 1839-49.

Weber, O. *Die Kunst der Hethiter*. *Orbis Pictus*. Band 9. n. d.

Wilson, Sir C. *Murray's Handbook of Asia Minor*. 2nd ed. (Out of print.)

LANGUAGES

Forrer, E. *Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches*. Z.D.M.G. LXXVI, pp. 174-269.

Kretschmer, P. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen, 1896.

(See also Hrozný, below, p. 660.)

¹ Some works are mentioned which have appeared since the chapter was printed. See, in general, the articles under names of peoples and countries in D.B., E. Bi., E. Brit., P.W., and O. Schrader's *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1917-. Cf. also the list, vol. 1, pp. 619-24.

ANTHROPOLOGY

Luschan, F. von. The early inhabitants of Asia. Huxley Lecture. J.A.I. xli, 1911.

Partly contained in his Wandervölker Kleinasiens. Z.E. xviii. (1900.)

Ungnad, A. Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Kleinasiens. Breslau, 1923.

Winckler, H. Die Völker Vorderasiens. Der alte Orient. 2nd ed. 1903.

Zaborowski, S. Les peuples aryens d'Asie et d'Europe. 1908.

For the Inscriptions of Lemnos in an unknown language see p. 650.

REGIONS OF ASIA MINOR

(Arranged according to the order in which they are treated.)

Hittites

[See the bibliography to chap. xi, below, p. 659 *sq.*]

Peoples of the Sea

[See the bibliography to chap. xii, below, pp. 661 *sqq.*]

Lycia

Arkwright, W. G. Lycian and Phrygian names. J.H.S. xxxviii (1918), pp. 45-73.

Benndorf, O. and G. Niemann. Reisen in Lykien und Karien. Vienna, 1884.

Kalinka, E. Tituli Asiae Minoris I. Vienna, 1901. (Lycian only.)

Kluge, Theod. Die Lykier: ihre Geschichte und ihre Inschriften. Der alte Orient. 1910.

Petersen, E. and F. von Luschan. Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratis. Vienna, 1889.

Spratt, T. A. B. and E. Forbes. Travels in Lycia, Milyas and the Cibyratis. 2 vols. 1847.

Sundwall, J. Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier nebst einem Verzeichnisse kleinasiatischer Namenstämme. Klio, 11 Beiheft, 1913. Cf. O. A. Danielsson: G.G.A. 1916, pp. 490-532. (See also under Etruscan.)

Thomsen, V. Études lyciennes (extrait du Bulletin de l'Ac. Roy.). Copenhagen, 1899.

Treuber, O. Geschichte der Lykier. Tübingen, 1887.

Caria

Beloch, J. Griechische Geschichte I (2nd ed.), 1, p. 97.

Meyer, Georg. Die Karier. Bezenberger's Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, x (1886), 147-202. (Now valuable only as a collection of material.)

Sayce, A. H. The Carian Language and Inscriptions. T.S.B.A. ix, 1885, pp. 112-54. Cf. P.S.B.A. 1895, pp. 39-43 and note, p. 207.

Sundwall, J. Zu den karianischen Inschriften und den darin vorkommenden Namen. Klio, xi, 464-80.

Leleges

Aly, W. Karer und Leleger. Phil. LXViii (1909), 428 *sqq.*

Deimling, K. W. Die Leleger. Leipzig, 1862. (Obsolete.)

Thraemer, E. Pergamos. Leipzig, 1888.

Lydia

- Littmann, E. *Lydian Inscriptions*, Part 1, being volume **vi** of Sardis publications of the American Society for the excavation of Sardis. Leyden, 1916. Cf. S. A. Cook, J.H.S. xxxvii, 77-86, 219-31; O. A. Danielsson, *Zu den lydischen Inschriften*, 1918 (Skrifter utgifna af K. H. Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala); J. Fraser, *The Lydian Language* (Anatolian Studies, presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay, 1923, pp. 139-50).
- Radet, E. *La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades (687-546 B.C.)*. 1893.
- For the Maeonian name see K. Meister, *Die homerische Schriftsprache*, 1921 (Preisschrift d. Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft), p. 151 sq.

Phrygia

- Brandenburg, E. *Phrygien und seine Stellung im kleinasiatischen Kulturkreis. Der alte Orient*. 1907.
- Calder, W. M. *Corpus Inscriptionum Neo-Phrygiarum*. J.H.S. xxxi, 161-215; xxxiii, 97-104.
- Fraser, J. *Phrygian Studies I (Language)*. Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, vi, Part ii. 1913.
- Körte, G. and A. Gordion. *Arch. Jahrb., Ergänz.heft. v*, 1904.
- Phythian-Adams, W. J. *Hittite and Trojan Allies*. 1922. (British School of Archaeology at Jerusalem, Bulletin No. 1.)
- Ramsay, Sir W. M. On the early historical relations between Phrygia and Cappadocia. J.R.A.S. 1883, pp. 100-35 (with reduced facsimiles of the Old Phrygian Inscriptions), Bezzenberger's Beiträge, xiv, pp. 308-12.
- Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 parts. 1895, 1897.

Mysia and the Troad, Bithynia

[See bibliography of Troy (p. 677) and Thrace (p. 651).]

Paphlagonia

- Leonhard, W. *Hittiter und Amazonen*. Leipzig, 1911. (Fanciful.)

Cappadocia

[See bibliography in vol. 1, p. 648, and below, p. 659, n. 1.]

- Chantre, E. *Recherches archéologiques dans l'Asie occidentale. Mission en Cappadoce*, 1893-4. 1898.
- Grothe, H. *Meine Vorderasien Expedition*, 1906-7. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1911-12.
- The location of many of the new peoples and places mentioned in the Boghaz-Keui Inscriptions are still vague; compare the map accompanying E. Forrer, M.D.O.G. No. 63 (March), 1924, with that in A. Götze, *Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit* (Heidelberg, 1924), or Mayer and Garstang, *Liv. A.A.* x (see p. 660*below).

Armenia

- Hommel, F. *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*. 2nd ed. Munich, 1904.
- Hübischmann, H. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, xvi, 204 sqq. (Incoming of Armenians into the Van country.)
- Lynch, H. F. B. *Armenia*. 2 vols. 1901 (vol. II, chap. iv).

Cilicia

Some part of Cilicia was apparently occupied by Arzawa, to which two letters in the Tell el-Amarna Collection were addressed. These were edited in 1902 by J. A. Knudtzon, who declared their language Indo-European. It is now identified with the official language of the Boghaz-Keui Inscriptions.

Heberdey, R. and A. Wilhelm. Reisen in Kilikien ausgeführt 1891 u. 1892. Denkschriften d. kais. Akad. d. Wissens. Vienna, 1896.

Ramsay, Sir W. M. Cilicia, Tarsus, and the Great Taurus Pass. Geog. Journal, 1903, pp. 357-413.

For the Cilician Empire with its capital at Tyana and extending to Carchemish on the east, Gurun and Cappadocia on the north, Hamath on the south and Lydia on the west, see A. H. Sayce, P.S.B.A. 1914, pp. 233 *sqq.*

Pisidia and Pamphylia

Lanckoronski, Niemann and Petersen. Städte Pamphyliens u. Pisidiens. 2 vols. Vienna, 1890, 1892.

The dialect of the Greek Inscriptions, which is archaic as well as much modified, is related by F. Bechtel (Die griechischen Dialekte, II, 797 [1923]) to the dialect of Crete.

CHAPTER II

THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE¹GENERAL WORKS²

- Déchelette, J. Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique, celtique et gallo-romaine. 5 parts. 1908-14.
- Deniker, J. The Races of Man. 1900.
- Dottin, G. Les anciens peuples de l'Europe. 1916.
- Dussaud, R. Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la mer égée. 2nd ed. 1914.
- Glötz, G. La civilisation égéenne. 1923.
- Jubainville, H. d'Arbois de. Les premiers habitants de l'Europe. 2 vols. 1889, 1894.
- Keane, A. H. Man past and present. Revised and largely re-written by A. Hingston Quiggin and A. C. Haddon. Cambridge, 1920. (Chapters XIII-XV.)
- Meyer, E. Gesch. d. Alt. I, II (especially pp. 809-95).
- Philippson, A. Das Mittelmeergebiet. Leipzig, 1904.
- Ratzel, F. Der Ursprung und die Wanderungen der Völker geographisch betrachtet. II. Geographische Prüfung der Thatsachen über den Ursprung der Völker Europas, 1900. (Berichte d. k. sächs. Ges. d. Wissenschaften 1898 und 1900.)
- Reclus, E. Europe, translated by Ravenstein. 1- . 1885- .
- Ripley, W. Z. The Races of Europe. 1900.
- Schwalbe, G. and E. Fischer. Anthropologie. (Kultur der Gegenwart, III, v.) Leipzig, 1923.
- Sergi, G. Europa. Turin, 1908.

REGIONS OF EUROPE

(Arranged according to the order in which they are treated.)

Iberian, Berber and Basque

- Gsell, S. Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord, 1- . 1913- .
- Schulten, A. Hispania (Spanish translation of S.'s article in P.W.) with appendix containing bibliography of everything relating to pre-Roman Spain by P. B. Gimpera. 1920.
- Numantia, I (Die Keltiberer und ihre Kriege mit Rom). Munich, 1914.
- See also below, p. 689.

Ligurians

- Herbig, G. Ligurer (in Hoops' Real-Lexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde).
- Jullian, C. Histoire de la Gaule, I, chap. IV. 1908.

Etruscans

- Besides articles by Conway in E. Brit., and Körte and Skutsch in P.W., see G. Herbig, Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen, S.B. Berlin, 1914, pp. 1-39.

See also the chapter on the Etruscans in vol. IV.

¹ See p. 645, note 1.

² See also the bibliography to chap. XXI.

Inscriptions of Lemnos

Bugge, S. Das Verhältniss der Etrusker zu den Indogermanen und der vorgriechischen Bevölkerung Kleinasiens und Griechenlands. Strassburg, 1909. (Linguistic only.)

Cousin and Durrbach. B.C.H. x (1886), pp. 1-6.

Karo, M. Die tyrrhenische Stele in Lemnos. Mitt. Arch. Inst. xxxiii (1908), 65-74.

Pauli, C. Altitalische Forschungen, II, 1 (1886), 2 (1894).

Torp, A. Die vorgriechische Inschrift von Lemnos (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Skrifter II, Hist.-filos. Klasse). 1903.

Sicani, Siculi, etc.

Freeman, E. A. History of Sicily, vol. 1. 1891.

Modestov, B. Introduction à l'histoire romaine. 1907.

Sanctis, G. de. Storia dei Romani, I. Chapters II and III. Turin, 1907.

Toscanelli, N. Le origini Italiche. Milan, 1914.

Veneti

Pauli, C. Altitalische Forschungen, III. Leipzig, 1892.

Messapians

Ribezzo, F. La Lingua degli antichi Messapii. Naples, 1907.

Illyrian and Albanian

Jokl, N. Linguistisch-kulturhistorische Untersuchungen aus dem Bereiche des Albanischen. Berlin, 1923.

Meyer, E. Die Pelasger in Forschungen zur alten Geschichte, Bd. 1, 1892, pp. 1-124. (Results often disputable.)

Treidler, H. Alte Völker der Balkanhalbinsel. Archiv f. Anthropologie, 1913, pp. 97-107.

— Epirotische Völker im Altertum. *Ib.* 1919, pp. 89 *sqq.*

Crete

See below, p. 676; also R. S. Conway, The pre-Hellenic inscriptions of Praesos, B.S.A. VIII (1901-2), pp. 125-56; x (1903-4), pp. 115-26.

Duckworth, W. L. H. Excavations at Palaikastro, II, §§ 11, 12; B.S.A. IX, pp. 344-55.

Cyprus

Myres, J. L. Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus. New York, 1914.

— and M. Ohnefalsch-Richter. The Cyprus Museum. Oxford, 1899.

Two inscriptions from Cyprus in an unknown tongue, but in the Cyprian script, are discussed by R. Meister, S.B. Preuss. Akad. 1911, pp. 166 *sqq.*

Greece

[See bibliographies below, pp. 677-84.]

Apart from tradition handed down in the ancient writers, evidence of different Greek strata in various districts (*e.g.* Chios and Crete) can be obtained from the dialect inscriptions. See F. Bechtel, Die griechischen Dialekte, 3 vols., Berlin, 1921-3, where the language of each linguistic area is discussed separately.

Macedonia

- Hoffmann, O. Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache u. ihr Volkstum. Göttingen, 1906.
 Rey, L. Observations sur les premiers habitants de la Macédoine recueillies par le Service archéologique de l'Armée d'Orient, 1916-19 (Région de Salonique). 1921.

Thrace

- Kazarow, G. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Thraker. Sarajevo, 1916.
 Kretschmer, P. Die erste thrakische Inschrift. Glotta, vi, pp. 74-79. 1914. Cf. G. Seure (Rev. Ét. Anc. xxii, 1920, pp. 1-21), who sees in the inscription only three names.
 Tomaschek, W. Die alten Thraker. S.B. Vienna. Vols. 128, 130, 131. 1893-4.

Scythians

[See bibliography to the chapter on the Scythians in vol. III.]

Sarmatia

- Diels, P. Die Slaven. Leipzig, 1920.
 Ebert, Max. Südrussland im Altertum. Bonn, 1921.

Celts

- Bertrand, A. and S. Reinach. Les Celtes dans les vallées du Pô et du Danube. 1894.
 Dottin, G. Manuel pour servir à l'étude de l'Antiquité celtique. 2nd ed. 1915.
 Holmes, T. Rice. Ancient Britain and Julius Caesar. 1907.
 ——— Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. 2nd ed. 1911 (pp. 256-340, The Ethnology of Gaul).
 Jullian, C. Histoire de la Gaule, I. 1908.
 Peake, H. The Bronze Age and the Celtic World. 1922.

Romans and Italic tribes

- Conway, R. S. The Italic Dialects. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1897.
 Nissen, H. Italische Landeskunde. 2 vols. Berlin, 1883, 1902.
 Peet, T. Eric. The stone and bronze ages of Italy and Sicily. Oxford, 1909.
 ——— Who were the Romans? A note on some recent answers. Liv. A.A. II (1909), pp. 185-93.
 Ridgeway, Sir W. Who were the Romans? Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. III. 1907.

Germans

- Chadwick, H. M. The origin of the English Nation. Cambridge, 1907.
 Kossinna, G. Die Herkunft der Germanen. 2nd ed. Würzburg, 1920.
 Müllenhoff, K. Deutsche Alterthumskunde. 5 vols. Berlin, 1870-. New ed. by Max Roediger, 1890-.
 Schmidt, Ludwig. Geschichte der deutschen Stämme. 2 parts. Berlin, 1910, 1918.
 Wels, K. H. Die germanische Vorzeit. Leipzig, 1923.
 Zeuss, J. K. Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme. Munich, 1837.
 See also Mannus, an important periodical edited by Kossinna since 1909.

CHAPTERS III—VIII

THE HISTORY OF EGYPT

I. GENERAL

- Bissing, F. W. *Geschichte Aegyptens in Umriss*. Berlin, 1904.
 Breasted, J. H. *A History of Egypt from the earliest times to the Persian Conquest*. 2nd ed. New York, 1910.
 — *A History of the Ancient Egyptians*. New York, 1908, 1920.
 Budge, Sir E. A. W. *History of Egypt*, II to V. 1902.
 — *History of the Egyptian People*. 1914.
 Griffith, F. Ll. *Art. Egypt*. E. Brit.
 Hall, H. R. *The Ancient History of the Near East*. 5th ed. 1920.
 King, L. W. and H. R. Hall. *Egypt and Western Asia in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. 1907.
 Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, I. 4th ed. Berlin, 1921.
 Müller, W. M. *Art. Egypt*. E. Bi.
 Newberry, P. E. and J. Garstang. *Short History of Egypt*. 1904.
 Petrie, Sir W. M. F. *History of Egypt*, II and III. 1899, 1905.
 Wiedemann, A. *Das alte Aegypten*. Heidelberg, 1920.

2. SOURCES

- Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt*. Chicago, 1906. (Vols. II to IV relate to this period.)
 Couyat, O. and P. Montet. *Inscriptions du Ouadi Hammamât*. Cairo, 1912.
 Déveria, P. J.A. 1865–8. (Articles on the Turin Judiciary Papyrus.)
 Erman, A. *Eine Reise nach Phönizien im XI. Jahrh. v. Chr. (Wenamón)*. Z. Aeg. xxxviii, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Gardiner, A. H. and T. E. Peet. *The Inscriptions of Sinai*. Vol. I. Egypt Exploration Society. 1917.
 Gauthier, H. *Livre des Rois*, II *sqq.* Mém. Inst. Fr. Caire.
 Golenischeff, W. *Papyrus hiératique de la collection W. Golénischeff (Wenamón)*. Rec. Trav. xxi, 74 *sqq.*
 Gunn, B. and A. H. Gardiner. *New Renderings of Egyptian Texts: II. The Expulsion of the Hyksos*. J.E.A. v, pp. 36 *sqq.*
 Kamal, Ahmed bey. *Stèle de l'an VIII de Ramsès II*. Rec. Trav. xxx, 213 *sqq.*
 Lacau, P. *Stèles du Nouvel Empire*. Cat. gén. du Mus. du Caire. Cairo, 1900–.
 Legrain, G. *La grande stèle de Toutankhamon à Karnak*. Rec. Trav. xxix, 162 *sqq.*
 — *Répertoire généalogique et onomastique du Musée du Caire*. Geneva, 1908.
 Newberry, P. E. *The Amherst Papyri*. 1899.
 Paton, D. *Early Egyptian Records of Travel*. Princeton, 1915–. (The XVIIIth Dynasty begins with vol. II.)
 Peet, T. E. *The Mayer Papyrus*. 1920.
 Playte, W. and F. Rossi. *Papyrus de Turin*. Leyden, 1869. (Numerous valuable historical documents.)
 Roeder, G. *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*. Heft v, vi, vii. Leipzig, 1913–14.
 Sethe, K. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. Leipzig, 1905–. (Constituting Abteilung IV of *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, ed. by Georg Steindorff.) Contains

all the monumental sources for the earlier part of the XVIIIth Dynasty. The first volume of a German translation by Sethe has appeared under the title *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie, I, bearbeitet und übersetzt von Kurt Sethe. Leipzig, 1914.*

Spiegelberg, W. *Correspondances du temps des rois-prêtres. Paris, 1895.*

— *Zwei Beiträge. Strassburg, 1898. (Tomb robbery documents.)*

— *Studien und Materialien zum Rechtswesen des Pharaonenreiches. Hannover, 1892. (Tomb robbery documents.)*

3. ARCHAEOLOGY

Amtliche Berichte aus den Preussischen Kunstsammlungen. Jahrgang xl. Important articles on the Tell el Amarna excavations.

Carter, H. and P. E. Newberry. *The Tomb of Thoutmôsis IV. 1904.*

Chassinat, E. *La seconde trouvaille de Deir el Bahari. Cat. gén. Mus. Caire. Cairo, 1909.*

Davies, Nina de G. and A. H. Gardiner. *The Tomb of Amenemhet. 1915.*

Davies, Norman de G. *The Rock Tombs of Tell el Amarna. (Archaeological Survey.) Six vols. London, 1903-.*

Davis, T. M. and others. *The Tomb of Ioniya and Touiyou. 1907.*

— *The Tomb of Queen Tiya. 1910.*

— *The Tomb of Hâtshopsîtû. 1906.*

— *The Tombs of Harmhabi and Touatânkhamanou. 1912.*

— *The Tomb of Siptah. 1908.*

Elliot-Smith, G. *The Royal Mummies. Cat. gén. Mus. Caire. Cairo, 1912.*

Erman, A. and O. Ranke. *Aegypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum. Tübingen (in progress).*

Gardiner, A. H. and A. E. P. Weigall. *Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs at Thebes. 1913.*

Guilmant, F. *Le Tombeau de Ramsès IX. Mém. Inst. Fr. du Caire. Cairo, 1907.*

Lepsius, R. *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien. Berlin, n. d.*

M.D.O.G. Nos. 34, 46, 50, 52, 55, and 57. (*Tell el-Amarna.*)

Naville, E. *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus. 1883.*

— *Goshen and the Shrine of Saft el Henneh. 1886.*

— *Deir el Bahari. 1897-.*

Peet, T. E., Woolley, C. L. and others. *The City of Akhenaten. Vol. 1. 1923.*

Petrie, Sir W. M. F. *Tell el Amarna. 1894.*

— and others. *Abydos, I, II and III. (Much archaeological material for this period.)*

Randall-MacIver, D. and A. C. Mace. *El Amrah and Abydos. 1902.*

Timme, P. *Tell el Amarna vor der deutschen Ausgrabung im Jahre 1911. Leipzig, 1917.*

Wreszinski, W. *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kultur. Leipzig, n. d. (Important tomb-pictures illustrating life under the Empire.)*

MISCELLANEOUS

Alt, A. *Pharao Thutmosis III in Palästina. Palästinajahrbuch, x (1914), 53-99. Berlin.*

Blackman, A. M. *A Study of the Liturgy celebrated in the Temple of the Aton at El-Amarna. Recueil Champollion, pp. 505-28.*

Borchardt, L. *Zur Baugeschichte des Amonstempels von Karnak. Leipzig, 1905. (In Band v of Sethe, Untersuchungen.)*

- Breasted, J. H. *A New Chapter in the Life of Thutmose III.* Leipzig, 1902. (In Band II of *Sethe, Untersuchungen.*)
- *The Battle of Kadesh.* Chicago, 1903.
- Budge, Sir E. A. Wallis. *Tutankhamen, Amenism, Atenism, and Egyptian Monotheism.* 1923.
- Burne, A. H. *Some Notes on the Battle of Kadesh.* J.E.A. vii, 191 *sqq.*
- Darassy, G. *Ramsès-si-Ptah.* Rec. Trav. xxxiv, 39 *sqq.*
- Elliot-Smith, G. *Tutankhamen and the Discovery of his Tomb.* 1923.
- Engelbach, R. *The Sarcophagus of Pa-Ramessu.* Ancient Egypt, 1922, pp. 9-13.
- Gardiner, A. H. *The Delta Residence of the Ramessides.* J.E.A. v (1918), pp. 127 *sqq.*, 179 *sqq.*, 242 *sqq.*
- *The Geography of the Exodus.* Rec. Champollion, pp. 203 *sqq.*
- *The Installation of a Vizier.* Rec. Trav. xxvi, 1 *sqq.*
- Gauthier. *Les fils royaux de Kouch et le personnel administratif de l'Éthiopie.* Rec. Trav. xxxix, 179-237.
- Griffith, F. Ll. *The Jubilee of Akhenaton.* J.E.A. v, pp. 61 *sqq.*
- Hall, H. R. *Egypt and the external world in the time of Akhenaton.* J.E.A. vii, 39 *sqq.*
- *The Peoples of the Sea.* Rec. Champollion, pp. 297-330.
- Junker, H. *The first appearance of the Negroes in History.* J.E.A. vii (1921), 121-32.
- Kühmann, C. *Die Ostgrenze Aegyptens.* Berlin, 1911.
- Langdon, S. and Gardiner, A. H. *The Treaty of Alliance between Hattusili, King of the Hittites, and the Pharaoh Ramesses II of Egypt.* J.E.A. vi, 179 *sqq.*
- Meyer, E. *Aegyptische Chronologie.* Berlin, 1904.
- Montet, P. *Byblos et l'Égypte.* Syria, II, 263-4.
- Naville, E. *Le père de Thoutmes III.* Rec. Trav. xxi, 201 *sqq.*
- Nelson, H. H. *The Battle of Megiddo.* Beirut, 1913.
- Passykin, E. de. *Les opérations militaires de Thoutmès III après la prise de Mageddo.* Rec. Trav. xxvi, 169 *sqq.*
- Peet, T. E. *Egypt and the Old Testament.* Liverpool, 1922.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. F. *Researches in Sinai.* 1906.
- Reisner, G. A. *The Viceroys of Ethiopia.* J.E.A. vi, 28 *sqq.*
- Sethe, K. *Beiträge zur Geschichte Amenophis' IV.* Götting. Gel. Nachrichten, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1922.
- *Die Thronwirren unter den Nachfolgern Königs Thutmosis' I, ihr Verlauf und ihre Bedeutung.* Leipzig, 1896. (In Heft 1 of the series *Sethe, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens.* Leipzig, 1896-.)
- *Die Prinzenliste von Medinet Habu und die Reihenfolge der ersten Könige der zwanzigsten Dynastie.* Leipzig, 1896. (In Heft 1 of *Sethe, Untersuchungen.*)
- *Die Einsetzung des Veziers unter der 18. Dynastie.* Leipzig, 1909. (In Band v of *Sethe, Untersuchungen.*)
- *Dodekaschoinos, das Zwölfmeilenlande an der Grenze von Aegypten und Nubien.* Leipzig, 1901. (In Band II of *Sethe, Untersuchungen.*)
- Weill, R. *Kames de Thèbes.* Cinquantenaire de l'École pr. d. Hautes Études, pp. 25-41.
- Winlock, H. E. *On Queen Tetisheri, Grandmother of Ahmose I.* Ancient Egypt, 1921, p. 14.
- Woolley, L. *The Egyptian Temple at Byblos.* J.E.A. vii, 200 *sqq.*

CHAPTER IX

CONTEMPORARY LIFE AND THOUGHT IN EGYPT¹

I. RELIGION

Erman, A. Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind. Abh. Berlin. Akad. der Wiss. 1901.

Lepsius, C. R. Das Totenbuch der Aegypter. Leipzig, 1842.

Naville, E. Das ägyptische Totenbuch. Berlin, 1886.

Sethe, K. Zur Komposition des Totenbuchspruches für das Herbeibringen der Fährte. Z. Aeg. lrv, pp. 1 sqq.

Blackman, A. M. The Sun-Cult in Ancient Egypt. Nature, April 14th, 1923, pp. 499 sqq. and April 21st, 1923, pp. 536 sqq.

Davies, N. de G. The Rock Tombs of Tell el Amarna. (Six vols. of the Archaeological Survey of Egypt, 1903 sqq., containing valuable work on Ikhnaton and his period.)

Mercer, S. A. B. Was Ikhnaton a Monotheist? J.S.O.R. III, 70 sqq. Chicago, 1919.

Schäfer, H. Altes und Neues zur Kunst und Religion von Tell el-Amarna. Z. Aeg. lv (1918), pp. 1 sqq. (Important work on Ikhnaton with valuable references to earlier writings on the subject.)

Weigall, A. E. P. The Life and Times of Akhenaton. 2nd ed. 1923.

Erman, A. Denksteine aus der thebanischen Gräberstadt. Berl. S.B. 1911. (Stela of Nebre and similar documents.) See also Gunn, below.

Gardiner, A. H. Ethics and Morality (Egyptian). E.R.E. (A study of the first importance for Egyptian religion, with copious translations from the Book of the Dead and other documents.)

Gunn, J. B. The Religion of the Poor in Ancient Egypt. J.E.A. III, 81 sqq.

2. LAW

On the tomb-robberies:

Papyrus Abbott. (Select Papyri in the Hieratic Character from the Collections of the British Museum, II, 1860.)

Papyri Amherst and Harris A. (Newberry, The Amherst Papyri, 1899.)

Papyrus Ambras. (Von Bergmann, Hieratische Texte, 6; the Vienna list of documents.)

Peet, T. E. The Mayer Papyri. 1920.

Pleyte, W. and F. Rossi. Papyrus de Turin. Leyden, 1869-76. (Turin Judiciary Papyrus.)

Erman, A. Beiträge zur Kenntniss des ägyptischen Gerichtsverfahrens. Z. Aeg. 1879, pp. 71 sqq. (Pap. Berlin 3047.)

Gardiner, A. H. The Inscription of Mes. Sethe's Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens. Band IV, Heft 3. Leipzig, 1905.

— The Installation of a Vizier. Rec. Trav. xxvi, pp. 1 sqq.

— Four Papyri of the 18th Dynasty from Kahun. Z. Aeg. XLIII, pp. 27 sqq. (Pap. Berlin 9875, a civil process. Also other business papyri and a discussion of Egyptian currency in metal rings.)

¹ The bibliography to vol. I, chap. IX should also be consulted. See vol. I, p. 643 sq.

- Griffith, F. Ll. The Inscriptions of Siut and Der Rifeh. 1889. (Plates 6-8 contain the contracts of Hapzefa.) See also Reisner.
 Reisner, G. A. The Tomb of Hepzefa, Nomarch of Siut. J.E.A. v, pp. 79 *seq.* (Includes rather free translation and admirable commentary on the contracts.)
 Sethe, K. Die Einsetzung des Veziers. Untersuchungen. Band v. 1909.

3. MATHEMATICS, ASTRONOMY AND MEDICINE

- Papyrus Rhind. (Facsimile of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus published by the Trustees of the British Museum, 1898.)
 Eisenlohr, A. Ein mathematisches Handbuch der alten Aegypter. Leipzig, 1877. (Very much out of date philologically.)
 Moscow Mathematical Papyrus. Unpublished. (One problem published by Turaeff in Ancient Egypt, 1917, pp. 100-2.)
 Griffith, F. Ll. The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus. P.S.B.A. xvi.
 Peet, T. E. The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus. Liverpool, 1923.
 Brugsch, H. Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum, Part I. Leipzig, 1883. (Contains most of the important material on astronomy. Accurate copies and more modern treatment badly needed.)
 Breasted, J. H. The Edwin Smith Papyrus. (Medical.) Recueil Champollion, 1923.
 Reisner, G. The Hearst Medical Papyrus. Leipzig, 1905.
 Wreszinski, W. Die Medizin der alten Aegypter. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1909-13. (Papyri Ebers, Hearst Med., Berlin Med. and London Med.; transcription, translation and commentary.)

LITERATURE

- Select Papyri in the Hieratic character from the Collections of the British Museum, 1841-60. (Anastasi and Sallier Papyri, etc.)
 Budge, Sir E. A. W. Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Second Series. 1923. (Photographic reproductions of the Sallier and other papyri.)
 Erman, A. Eine Reise nach Phönizien im 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Z. Aeg. xxxviii, pp. 1 *seq.* (Golenischeff Papyrus, Story of Wenamon; translation and commentary.)
 Gardiner, A. H. Literary Texts of the New Kingdom. (Series I of Egyptian Hieratic Texts.) Part I, Papyri Anastasi I and Koller.
 Müller, W. Max. Die Liebespoesie der alten Aegypter. Leipzig, 1899.
 Steindorff, G. Eine neue Sammlung von Liebesliedern. (Aegyptiaca, Festschrift für Georg Ebers, 1897, pp. 117-21.)

CHAPTER X

ASSYRIA¹

I. GENERAL HISTORY

- Breasted, J. H. See p. 652.
 Budge, E. A. W. *A History of Egypt*. Vols. III-IV. 1902.
 Hall, H. R. *The Ancient History of the Near East*. 1920.
 ——— *Egypt and the External World in the Time of Akhenaten*. J.E.A. vii, 1921, pp. 39-99.
 King, L. W. *Records of Tukulti-Ninib I*. 1904.
 ——— *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*. Vols. I, II. 1907.
 ——— *A History of Babylon*. 1915.
 Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, I. 4th ed. Berlin, 1921.
 Olmstead, A. T. *Tiglath-Pileser I and his Wars*. J.A.O.S. xxxvii, 1917, p. 169.
 ——— *Kashshites, Assyrians and the Balance of Power*. A.J.S.L. xxxvi, 1919, p. 120.
 ——— *Ashur-nasir-apal*. J.A.O.S. xxxviii, 1918, p. 209.
 ——— *History of Assyria*. 1923.
 Rogers, R. W. *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*. New York, 1915.

2. CHRONOLOGY AND SPECIAL HISTORY

- Budge, E. A. W. and C. Bezold. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*. London, 1892.
 ——— and L. W. King. *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*. London, 1902.
 Delitzsch, F. *Die babyl. Chronik*. Leipzig, 1906.
 Hilprecht, H. V. *Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Tablets*. Babylonian Expedition of Pennsylvania, xx, 1.
 King, L. W. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, xxxiv, 1914. (For text of Synchronous History.)
 Knudtzon, J. A. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*. Leipzig, 1915.
 Langdon, S. and A. Gardiner. (See p. 659.)
 Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. *Berosos' Chronologie*. Klio, viii, 1908, p. 227; xvi, 1919, p. 109; 1920, p. 242.
 Luckenbill, D. D. *Inscriptions of Early Assyrian Rulers*. A.J.S.L. xxviii, 1912, p. 153.
 ——— *Hittite Treaties and Letters*. A.J.S.L. xxxvii, 1921, p. 161.
 Meisserschmidt, L. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*. Leipzig, 1911. See Memnon, vi, 195.
 Pinches, T. G. *The Kings' List*. P.S.B.A. 1884, p. 193.
 ——— *Records of the Past*. New Series, v, 106.
 ——— *The Language of the Kassites*. J.R.A.S. 1917, p. 101.
 Rawlinson, H. C. *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, II, 65; III, 4, 3 (for text of Synchronous History).
 Schnabel, P. *Studien zur babyl.-assyrl. Chronologie*. M.V.A.G. 1908, 1.
 ——— *Die babyl. Chronologie in Berosos' Babyloniaka*. M.V.A.G. 1908, 5.
 Schroeder, O. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, historischen Inhalts*. Heft 2. 1922.
 Smith, George. *On Fragments of an Inscription*. P.S.B.A. 1874, p. 371.
 Thureau-Dangin, F. *La Deuxième Dynastie du Canon Royal*. Z.A. xxi, p. 176.

¹ See also the list, vol. I, p. 652.

Ungnad, A. Die synchronist. Königslisten aus Assur. Z.D.M.G. LXXII, 313 599.

Weidner, E. F. Studien zur assyr.-babyl. Chronologie. M.V.A.G. 1915, 4.

— Die Könige von Assyrien. *Id.* 1921, 2.

Winckler, H. Altorientalische Forschungen, 1, 1897.

3. CIVILIZATION AND LANGUAGE

Belser, C. W. Babylonische Kudurru-Inschriften. B. z. Ass. 1891, p. 165.

Bork, F. Die Mitanni-Sprache. M.V.A.G. 1909.

Cowley, A. E. The Hitites. 1920.

Cuq, E. La Propriété foncière en Chaldée. Nouvelle Revue Historique, 1906, p. 701.

Delitzsch, F. Die Sprache der Kossäer. Leipzig, 1884.

Frank, K. Bilder und Symbole der babyl.-assyr. Götter. Leipzig. Semit. Stud. 11, 2, 1906.

Hinke, W. J. A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I. Philadelphia, 1907.

— Selected Kudurru Inscriptions. Leiden, 1911.

Hommel, F. Ursprung des Tierkreises. Aufsätze und Abhandlungen, 1900, p. 236.

Hrozný, F. Die Sprache der Hethiter. Leipzig, 1916.

— Ueber die Völker und Sprachen des alten Chatti-Landes. Leipzig, 1920.

King, L. W. Babylonian Boundary-Stones in the British Museum. 1912.

Koschaker, P. Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu den 'altassyrischen Gesetzen.' Leipzig, 1922.

Lewy, J. Studien zu den altassy. Texten aus Kappadokien. Berlin, 1922.

Maspero, G. The Dawn of Civilization. 5th ed. 1910.

— The Struggle of the Nations. 2nd ed. 1910.

Messerschmidt, L. Mitanni-Studien. M.V.A.G. 1899, IV.

Sayce, A. H. On the Warwick Boundary Stone. P.S.B.A. XIX, 70.

Scheil, V. In De Morgan, Délégation en Perse. 1900.

CHAPTER XI

THE HITTITES OF ASIA MINOR

The publication and study of the cuneiform tablets discovered at Boghaz Keui proceed so rapidly that this bibliography can serve only as an introduction to the subject. Texts are being edited by the Berlin Museum (*Keilschrifturkunden aus B.K.*) by Figulla, Weidner and Walther, and articles and critical reviews constantly appear in such Oriental journals as the *J.R.A.S.*, *J.E.A.*, *A.J.S.L.*, *J.A.O.S.*, *Z.A.*, *O.L.Z.*, *Z.D.M.G.*, etc.

I. GENERAL HISTORY¹

- Cara, C. C. A. di. Hethci, Pelasgi. Rome, 1900-2.
 Contenau, G. *Éléments de Bibliographie Hittite*, 1922. (Bibliography and history of Hittite research.)
 Cowley, A. *The Hittites*. (Schweich Lectures.) 1918.
 Garstang, J. *The Land of the Hittites*. 1910.
 Hall, H. R. *Anc. Hist. of the Near East*. 1920. (Chap. viii.)
 Hogarth, D. G. *Art. Hittites*. *E. Brit.* 11th ed.
 Luckenbill, D. D. *The Hittites*. *Amer. J. Theol.* xviii, 1914, p. 24.
 Messerschmidt, L. *The Hittites*. *Anc. East Series*, vi, 1903.
 Meyer, E. *Reich und Kultur der Chetiter*. Berlin, 1914.
 Otto, W. *Die Hethiter*. *Hist. Zeit.* cxvii (1917), pp. 189 *sqq.*, 465 *sqq.*
 Winckler, H. *M.D.O.G.* 1907, No. 35.

2. SPECIAL HISTORY

- Luckenbill, D. D. Some Hittite and Mitannian personal names. *A.J.S.L.* xxvi, p. 96.
 Müller, W. Max. *Asien u. Europa* (chap. xxv). Leipzig, 1893.
 Roeder, G. *Aegypten und Hethiter*. *Der Alte Orient*, xx. Leipzig, 1919.

3. TREATIES

- Figulla, H. H. and E. F. Weidner. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, 1, 1916. Eng. trans. by D. D. Luckenbill in *A.J.S.L.* xxxvii, 1921, pp. 161 *sqq.*
 Golla, E. *Der Vertrag d. Hattikönigs Muršil mit dem Könige Šunaššura von Kizwadna*. Breslau, 1920.
 Hrozný, F. *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. *Boghazköi-Studien*, iii, 1, 1919-20.
 Langdon, S. and A. Gardiner. *The Treaty between Hattushil and Ramses II.* *J.E.A.* vi, pp. 179-205.
 Meissner, B. *The Šunaššura treaty*. *S.B. Berlin*, 1917, p. 282; and *Schles. Gesell. f. Vaterl. Cultur, Phil. Arch. Sect.* xcv, 1917, p. 12; *Z.D.M.G.* lxxii, 1918, 36 *sqq.*

4. LAWS, ETC.

- Friedrich, J. and Zimmern, H. *Hethitische Gesetze*. *Der Alte Orient*, xxiii, 1922.
 Hrozný, F. *Code Hittite*. *Hethitica*. Paris, 1922.
 See also E. Forrer. *Ausbeute aus den B. K. Inschriften*. *M.D.O.G.* lxi, 1921; *Die B. K. Texte in Umschrift*. Leipzig, 1923; E. F. Weidner, *Politische Documente aus Kleinasien*. Leipzig, 1923.

¹ For the Cappadocian texts see vol. 1, p. 648, and J. Lewy, *Studien zu den altass. Texten aus Kappadokien*. Berlin, 1922.

5. GEOGRAPHY

- Garstang, J. *Op. cit.* 1 above.
 Hogarth, D. G. The Hittite Monuments of Eastern Asia Minor. (Anatolian Studies. Ramsay Presentation Volume.) 1923.
 Mayer, L. A. and J. Garstang. Index of Hittite Names. I. Geographical. Bulletin, Brit. School Arch. Jerusalem, 1923. Also, *Liv. A.A.* x, 172 (1923).
 Sayce, A. H. The Early Geography of S.E. Asia Minor. *J.H.S.* XLIII. 1. 44.
 Smith, S. Kizzuwadna and Kode. *J.E.A.* VIII, p. 45.

6. LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT

- Bloomfield, M. A.J. *Ph.* xxv, 1904, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Cowley, A. See 1 above.
 Forrer, E. S.B. Berlin, 1919, p. 1029, and *Z.D.M.G.* 1922, p. 174 (on the Kanesian language).
 Frank, C. Die sogenannten hethit. Hieroglypheninschriften. *Z.D.M.G. Abh.* xvi, 3 (1923).
 Friedrich, J. Die hethit. Sprache. *Z.D.M.G.* 1922, p. 153.
 Herbig, G. Review of O. Weber, *Boghazköi-Studien* (Leipzig, 1916-20). *G.G.A.* 1921, pp. 193-218.
 Hrozný, F.¹ Die Sprache der Hethiter. *Boghazköi-Studien*, 1, 1917.
 — Über die Völker u. Sprachen des alten Chatti-Landes. *B.K. St.* v, 1920.
 King, L. W. Note on the Hittite problem. *J.E.A.* iv, 190 *sqq.*
 Messerschmidt, L. *Corpus Inscr. Hettitarum.* M.V.A.G. 1900, 1906.
 Prince, J. D. Hittite Material in the Cuneiform Inscriptions. *A.J.S.L.* xxxii, 38 *sqq.*
 Sayce, A. H. *P.S.B.A. passim* since 1876 (esp. 1903 *sqq.*), and *J.R.A.S.* 1920, pp. 49 *sqq.*; 1922, pp. 537 *sqq.*
 Sommer, F. Hethitisches. *Boghazköi-Studien*, iv, 1920, 1922.
 Thompson, R. C. *Archaeologia.* 2nd Ser. xiv.
 Weidner, E. F. *Studien zur hethitischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Leipzig, 1917.

7. HITTITE CIVILIZATION AND ART (MONUMENTS)

- Chantre, E. *Mission en Cappadoce.* 1898.
 Garstang, J. See 1 above.
 Meyer, E. See 1 above.
 Perrot, G. and Ch. Chipiez. *Hist. of Art in Sardinia, etc.* Eng. ed. II, 1890.
 — and E. Guillaume. *Exploration arch. de la Galatie, etc.* 1862-72.
 Pottier, E. *L'Art Hittite.* Syria, 1, ii.
 Puchstein, O. *Boghazköi; Die Bauwerke.* Leipzig, 1912.
 Ramsay, Sir W. M. *The Thousand and One Churches.* 1909.
 — and D. G. Hogarth. *Rec. Trav.* xiv, xv.
 Reber, F. von. Die Stellung der Hethiter in der Kunstgeschichte. *S.B. Bayer. Akad., Abhandlung* 13, 1910.
 Westheim, P. *Hethitische Kunst.* Berlin, 1921.

¹ For criticisms of Hrozný's position see Bork, *O.L.Z.* 1920, col. 60 *sqq.*, 211 *sqq.*; Weidner, *ib.* 114 *sqq.*; Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.* 1921, pp. 195 *sqq.*; J. D. Prince, *ib.* 210 *sqq.* On the Hittite languages, see also Hall, *J.E.A.* 1922, p. 219 n., and the Ramsay Presentation Volume, p. 173 n.; also articles in the latter by Fraser and Sayce.

CHAPTER XII

THE KEFTIANS, PHILISTINES, AND OTHER PEOPLES
OF THE LEVANT¹

I. BOOKS

- Alt, A. *Israel u. Aegypten*. Leipzig, 1909.
 Bossert, H. Th. *Alt-Kreta*. Berlin, 1921.
 Breasted, *Ancient Records*, 11-14. Chicago, 1904.
 Brugsch, H. *Geographische Inschriften*, 1. Leipzig, 1857.
 — *Histoire d'Égypte*, 1. Leipzig, 1859. (The last views of Brugsch on this subject were very erroneous, and his Egypt under the Pharaohs, e.g., should not be consulted.)
 Burney, C. F. *The Book of Judges*. 1918.
 — *Israel's settlement in Canaan*. Schweich Lectures. 3rd ed. 1921.
 Chabas, F. J. *Études sur l'antiquité historique*. 1872-3.
 Chadwick, H. M. *The Heroic Age* (pp. 178, 188 *sqq.*, 454 *sqq.*). Cambridge, 1912.
 Champollion, F., le Jeune. *Grammaire*, pp. 151, 180. 1836.
 — *Dictionnaire Hiérog.*, pp. 66, 314. 1841.
 Curtius, E. *Die Ionier vor der ionischen Wanderung*. Berlin, 1855.
 Evans, Sir A. J. *Scripta Minoa*. 1909.
 — *Palace of Minos*, 1. 1922.
 Fick, A. *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*. Göttingen, 1905.
 Fimmen, D. *Zeit u. Dauer der myken. Kultur*. Leipzig, 1909.
 Hall, H. R. *The Oldest Civilization of Greece*. 1901.
 — *Aegean Archaeology*. 1915.
 — *Ancient History of the Near East*. 5th ed. 1920.
 Hitzig, J. *Urgeschichte der Philistäer*. Leipzig, 1845.
 Hoeck, Carl. *Kreta*. Göttingen, 1823-9.
 Hogarth, D. G. *Ionia and the East*. 1909.
 Knudtzon, J. A. *Die el-Amarna-Tafeln*. Leipzig, 1907.
 Kretschmer, P. W. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen, 1896.
 Macalister, R. A. S. *Excavation of Gezer*. 1912.
 — *History of Civilization in Palestine*. 1921.
 — *The Philistines*. Schweich Lectures. 1913.
 — and E. Bliss. *Excavations in Palestine*. 1902.
 Mackenzie, D. *Excavations at Ain Shems (Beth-shemesh)*. *Palestine Exploration Fund Annual*, 1911. 1912-13.
 Maspero, Sir G. *Histoire ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique*, 11. Paris, 1895.
 — *The Struggle of the Nations*. 2nd ed. 1910.
 Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1. 1921.
 — *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle, 1906.
 Müller, W. M. *Asien u. Europa*. Leipzig, 1893.
 — *Egyptological Researches*. Washington, 1906. (For Egyptian pictures of foreigners.)
 Murray, A. S., A. H. Smith and H. B. Walters. *Excavations in Cyprus*. 1900.

¹ References to the older literature of the subject are given, as it is important. The modern literature may be said to begin about 1890.

- Niebuhr, C. Studien u. Bemerkungen zur Gesch. des Alten Orients: Zur Lage von Alaschja, pp. 97 *sqq.* Leipzig, 1894.
 Noordtzijs, M. De Filistijnen: hun Afkomst en Geschiedenis. Kampen, 1905.
 Petrie, Sir W. M. F. Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara. 1890.
 Stark, K. Gaza u. die Philistäische Küste. Jena, 1852.

2. SEPARATE ARTICLES

- Albright, W. F. A Revision of early Hebrew Chronology. Journ. Pal. Or. Soc. 1, 1921, pp. 49 *sqq.*
 Birch, S. Mémoire sur une Patère égyptienne. Mém. Soc. Imp. Ant. Fr. 1858.
 — A Historical Tablet of the Reign of Thothmes III. (Archaeologia, 185.)
 Bissing, Fr. W. v. Eine Bronzeschale mykenischer Zeit. J.D.A.I. xiii, 1898, pp. 50 *sqq.*
 Cook, S. A. Art. Philistines. E. Brit. 11th ed. 1911.
 Evans, Sir A. J. J.R.A.I. 1900. (On Cyprus Excavations.)
 Farina, G. I popoli del Mare. Aegyptus, 1, 8.
 Hall, H. R. Kefiu and the Peoples of the Sea. B.S.A. viii, 1902, pp. 157 *sqq.*
 — The Kefiu Fresco in the Tomb of Senmut. *Ibid.* x, 1904, p. 154.
 — An Addition to the Senmut Fresco. *Ibid.* p. 16.
 — Caphtor and Casluhim. Man, 1904, No. 92.
 — The Discoveries in Crete and their Relation to the History of Egypt and Palestine. P.S.B.A. xxxi, 1909, pp. 135 *sqq.*
 — A Note on the Phaistos Disc. J.H.S. xxxii, 1911, p. 119.
 — The Land of Alashiya. J. Man. E.O.S. 1913, p. 33.
 — Egypt and the External World in the Time of Akhenaten. J.E.A. vii, 1921, pp. 39 *sqq.*
 — The Peoples of the Sea. Mélanges Champollion, 1922, pp. 297 *sqq.*
 — The Hittites and Egypt. Ramsay Memorial Volume, 1923, p. 165.
 — Palestine under the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties. Palest. Explor. Fund, Q.S. 1923, pp. 124 *sqq.*
 — and Burchardt, H. A Shardina Sword from Gaza. Proc. Soc. Anc. 1914.
 Lichtenberg, Fr. v. Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte von Kypros. M.V.A.G. 1906.
 — Einflüsse der ägäischen Kultur auf Ägypten u. Palästina. M.V.A.G. 1911.
 Macalister, R. A. S. The Inscription of the Phaestos Disc. Proc. Royal Irish Acad. xxx, 14.
 Maspero, Sir G. Revue Critique, 1873, pp. 81 *sqq.* (=Bibl. Ég. vii, pp. 97 *sqq.*); 1875, pp. 390 *sqq.* (=Bibl. Ég. vii, pp. 183 *sqq.*); 1878, 1, p. 320.
 — Les Ilim. Rec. Trav. viii, 1886, p. 84.
 — Le Pays d'Alasia. *Ib.* x, 1888, p. 209.
 Moore, G. F. Art. Philistines. E. Bi.
 Müller, W. M. Das Land Alasia. Z.A. x, 1895, p. 257.
 — Die Urheimat der Philister: Die Papyrus Golenischeff: Die Chronologie der Philistereinwanderungen. M.V.A.G. v, 1900.
 — Neue Darstellungen 'mykenischer' Gesandter u. phöniciischer Schiffe. *Ib.* ix, 1904, pp. 13 *sqq.*
 — Kaphtor. O.L.Z. xiii, 110.
 Myres, J. L. The History of Eusebian Thalassocracies. J.H.S. xxvi, 1906, pp. 84 *sqq.*
 — History of the Pelasgian Theory. *Ib.* xxvii, 1907, pp. 107 *sqq.*
 Petrie, Sir W. M. F. Notes on the XIXth Dynasty. P.S.B.A. xxiv, 1902, pp. 317 *sqq.*
 Phythian-Adams, W. J. Brit. School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. Bulletins 1-111.
 Poulsen, F. Zur Zeitbestimmung der Enkomi-Funde. J.D.A.I. 1911, pp. 215 *sqq.*
 Reinach, A. Le Disque de Phaistos et les Peuples de la Mer. Rev. A. 1910, pp. 14 *sqq.*

- Rougé, E. de. *Étude sur divers Monuments*. Rev. A. 1861, pp. 96 *sqq.*, 394 (= Maspero, *Bibl. Ég.* xxiv, pp. 117 *sqq.*).
- *Mémoire sur les attaques... par les Peuples de la Méditerranée*. Rev. A. 1867, pp. 38 *sqq.* (= Maspero, *Bibl. Ég.* xxiv, pp. 417 *sqq.*).
- Smolenski, T. *Les Peuples septentrionaux de la Mer*. Ann. Serv. xv, 1915, p. 49.
- Spiegelberg, W. *Zur Kfto-Frage*. Z.A. viii, p. 384. (On Keftian names in Eg. hieratic.)
- O.L.Z. xi, 1908, 426. (On Caphtor.)
- Steindorff, G. Arch. Anz., December, 1891. (On the Keftian figures in the Rekhmire tomb.)
- Thiersch, H. *Die neueren Ausgrabungen in Palästina*. J.D.A.I., Arch. Anz. 1908, pp. 244 *sqq.* (Philistine Pottery.)
- Wainwright, G. *The Keftiu-people of the Egyptian Monuments*. Liv. A.A. vi, 1913, pp. 24 *sqq.*
- Walters, H. B. See Murray, A. S., p. 661.
- Weill, R. Rev. A. 1904, pp. 52 *sqq.* (On the Peoples of the Sea and the Cretan discoveries.)
- Welch, F. B. *The Influence of Aegean Civilisation in South Palestine*. Palest. Explor. Fund, Q.S., Oct. 1900 (= B.S.A. vi, 1900, pp. 117 *sqq.*).
- Wiedemann, A. O.L.Z. xiii, 50. (Caphtor.)
- Woolley, C. L. *La Phénicie et les peuples égéens*. Syria. 1921.
- *Asia Minor, Syria and the Aegean*. Liv. A.A. ix, 1922, pp. 41 *sqq.*

CHAPTER XIII

SYRIA AND PALESTINE IN THE LIGHT OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

I. TEXTS

The Amarna tablets. Indispensable and superseding all earlier editions is the voluminous work of J. A. Knudtzon (with Otto Weber and Erich Ebeling): *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, i. texts, ii. notes and indexes. Leipzig, 1915.

Further notes and comments appear in *O.L.Z.* 1915, cols. 211, 291; 1916, cols. 138, 181; 1917, col. 105; *Memnon*, III, 163, etc. Other el-Amarna fragments are published in *M.D.O.G.* 1914, No. 55, pp. 39-45; *A.J.S.L.* xxxiii, 1-8, 89 *sq.*; and (some of importance) by Thureau-Dangin, *Rev. Ass.* xix, 91-108 (cf. also *Recueil Champollion*, pp. 377-82; and see P. Dhorme, *Rev. Bib.* 1924, pp. 5 *sqq.*).

Böhl, F. M. T. *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*. Leipzig. *Semit. Stud.* v, 2, 1909.
Dhorme, P. *Les pays bibliques au temps d'El-Amarna*. *Rev. Bib.* v (1908), 500-19; vi (1909), 50-73, 368-85.

— *La langue de Canaan*. *Rev. Bib.* x (1913), 369-93; xi (1914), 37-59, 344-72.

The Boghaz Keui tablets:

Luckenbill, D. D. *Hittite Treaties and Letters*. *A.J.S.L.* xxxvii (1921), 161-211.
See also p. 659 above.

The Taanach tablets:

See Sellin, below. Also H. Gressmann, *Z. Ass.* xxviii, 102; *id.*, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder*, I, 128 *sq.*; F. E. Peiser, *O.L.Z.* 1903, col. 321 *sq.*; Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 350 *sq.*

For the Egyptian evidence:

Breasted, J. *Ancient Records of Egypt*. Vols. II-V. Chicago, 1906. See also above, pp. 652, 661.

2. EXCAVATIONS OF PALESTINE

Bliss, F. J. *A Mound of many Cities, or Tell el-Hesi excavated*. London, 1898.

— and R. A. S. Macalister. *Excavations in Palestine, 1898-1900*. (With a chapter by Wünsch.) 1902.

Lyon, D. *Excavations at Samaria*. *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 1909-11; also R. Kittel, *Theolog. Lit. Bl.* 1911, Nos. 3 and 4.

Macalister, R. A. S. *The Excavations of Gezer*. 3 vols. 1912. See also Bliss, F. J. Mackenzie, D. *Excavations at Ain-Shems (Beth-Shemesh)*. *Palestine Exploration Fund Annual*, 1911 and 1912-13.

Petrie, Sir W. M. Flinders. *Tell el-Hesi (Lachish)*. 1891.
— *Researches in Sinai*. 1906.

Schumacher, G. *Tell el-Mutesellim* (ed. K. Steuernagel). Leipzig, 1908.

Sellin, E. *Tell Ta'annek* (with appendix by F. Hrozný on the cuneiform inscriptions of Taanach). *Denkschriften of the Vienna Academy, phil.-hist. Kl.* I, LII. Vienna, 1904-5.

— and C. Watzinger. *Jericho*. Leipzig, 1913. (See also *Z.D.P.V.* xxxvi, 1913, pp. 49 *sqq.*)

Woolley, C. L. and T. E. Lawrence. Wilderness of Zin. Palest. Exploration Fund Annual, 1914.

See also the Palestine Exploration Fund, Q.S.; Rev. Bib.; M.D.P.V., and the Bulletins of the Schools of Archaeology (British, American) at Jerusalem.

3. GENERAL WORKS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EXTERNAL (i.e. NON-BIBLICAL) MATERIAL

Autran, C. Les Phéniciens: essai de contribution à l'histoire antique de la Méditerranée. 1920.

Barton, G. A. A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Social and Religious. New York, 1902.

— Archaeology and the Bible. Philadelphia, 1916.

Benzinger, I. Hebräische Archäologie. 2nd ed. Freiburg i. B. 1907.

Bertholet, A. Kulturgeschichte Israels. Göttingen, 1919.

Böhl, F. M. T. Kanaanäer und Hebräer. Leipzig, 1911.

Burney, C. F. Commentary on Judges. 1918. (Pp. xv-cxviii, an invaluable survey of the external evidence.)

Clay, A. T. The Empire of the Amorites. New Haven, 1919.

Cook, S. A. The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Second Millennium B.C. 1908.

— Palestinian Excavations and the History of Israel. The Expositor, 1909, August, pp. 97-114.

— Notes on the Old Canaanite Religion. *Id.* 1910, August, pp. 111-27.

Cooke, G. A. Art. Phoenicia in E. Brit.

Cowley, A. E. See Gardiner.

Dahl, G. Materials for the History of Dor. New Haven, 1915.

Driver, S. R. Modern Research as illustrating the Bible. The Schweich Lecture, 1908.

Eiselen, F. C. Sidon. New York, 1907.

Fleming, W. B. History of Tyre. New York, 1915.

Gardiner, A. H. and A. E. Cowley. J.E.A. III, 1916, 1 sqq. (On the Egyptian origin of the Semitic Alphabet.)

Golla, E. Der Vertrag d. Hatikönigs Muršil mit dem Könige Šunaššura. Breslau, 1920. (See O.L.Z. 1923, col. 160. Mutallu, not Murshil, concludes the treaty.)

Grapow, H. Vergleiche u. andere bildliche Ausdrücke in Aegyptischen. Der Alte Orient. Leipzig, 1920.

Gressmann, H. Hadad und Baal nach den Amarna-briefen u. nach ägypt. Texten. Baudissin Festschrift. Giessen, 1918, pp. 191-216.

Gustava, A. Hethitische Parallelen zum Namen Uriyyah. Z.A.T.W. xxxiii, 201-6.

Hall, H. R. Ancient History of the Near East. 5th ed. 1920. (Pp. 257 sqq., 341 sqq.)

— Egypt and the external world in the Time of Akhenaten. J.E.A. vii (1921), 39-53.

Handcock, P. S. P. The Archaeology of the Holy Land. 1916.

Hogg, H. W. Art. Mesopotamia in E. Brit.

— Recent Assyriology. Publications, Univ. of Manchester, Theol. Ser. 1, 1905, pp. 65-104.

Jirku, A. Neues keilinschrift. Material z. Alt. Test. Z.A.T.W. xxxix (1922), 146-60.

— Altorientalischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Leipzig, 1923.

Kittel, R. Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1. Palästina in der Urzeit: das Werden des Volkes. 5th ed. Gotha, 1923. (Very valuable.)

- Konow, Sten. *The Aryan Gods of the Mitani People*. Royal Frederik Univ., Publications of the India Institute. Christiania, 1921.
- Kraeling, E. G. H. *Aram and Israel*. New York, 1918.
- Lagrange, M. J. *Études sur les Religions Sémitiques*. 2nd ed. 1905.
- Langdon, S. and A. Gardiner. See above, p. 659.
- Luckenbill, D. D. *Mitannian and Hittite Names*. A.J.S.L. xxvi, 96 *sqq.*; xxvii, 270 n.
- Meyer, Eduard. *Art. Phoenicia* in E. Bi.
- Meyer, M. A. *History of the City of Gaza*. New York, 1907.
- Müller, W. M. *Asien und Europa nach altägypt. Denkmälern*. Leipzig, 1893.
- *Egyptological Researches*. I, 1906; II, 1910. Washington.
- *Ancient Egyptian Documents for the history of Palestine*. J.Q.R. iv (1913-14), 651-6.
- Olmstead, A. T. *Near-East Problems in the Second Pre-Christian Millennium*. J.E.A. viii (1922), 223 *sqq.*
- Paton, L. B. *Early History of Syria and Palestine*. 1902.
- Roeder, G. *Aegypter und Hethiter. Der Alte Orient*. Leipzig, 1919.
- Schiffer, S. *Die Aramäer*. Leipzig, 1911.
- Sellin, E. *Der Ertrag d. Ausgrabungen im Orient für die Erkenntnis der Entwicklung der Religion Israels*. Leipzig, 1905.
- Smith, Sir George Adam. *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. 13th ed. 1906.
- Strecke, M. *Ueber die älteste Geschichte d. Aramäer*. Klio, vi, 185-225.
- Thiersch, H. J.D.A.I. 1907, pp. 275 *sqq.*; 1908, pp. 3 *sqq.*, 343 *sqq.*; 1909, pp. 347 *sqq.*, 573 *sqq.*; and Z.D.P.V. xxxvi (1913), 40 *sqq.* (On the Palestinian excavations.)
- Thomsen, P. *Kompendium der paläst. Altertumskunde*. Tübingen, 1913.
- Torge, P. *Aschera und Astarte. Ein Beitrag zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1902.
- Ungnad, A. *Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Vorderasiens. Kulturfragen, heft 1*. Breslau, 1923.
- Vincent, H. *Canaan d'après l'Exploration récente*. 1907.
- Weill, R. *Phéniciens, Égéens et Hellènes dans la Médit. primitive*. Syria, II, 120 *sqq.*
- *Sur la dissémination géog. du nom de peuple dans le monde égéo-asiatique*. Syria, III, 27 *sqq.*
- Winckler, H. *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 1- . Berlin, 1897-1906.
- *Art. Syria* in E. Bi.
- Wood, W. C. *Religion of Canaan*. J.B.L. xxxv (1916), 1-133, 163-279.
- Woolley, C. L. *La Phénicie et les Peuples égéens*. Syria, II, 177 *sqq.*
- Zimmern, H. and J. Friedrich. *Die Briefwechsel zwischen Subbiluliuma und der Witwe des Bibhuriaš*. Z.A. xxxv, 37-41.
- and H. Winckler. *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. Berlin, 1903. (Very suggestive.)

CHAPTER XIV

THE RISE OF ISRAEL

For the 'external' evidence see the bibliography to the preceding chapter. The 'internal' evidence concerns the Old Testament as a whole, and is dealt with in the critical literature on the Old Testament, biblical history and religion, etc., for summaries of which see vol. III (Bibliographies).

1. O.T. CRITICISM

There are four classics:

- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. With a reprint of the article 'Israel' from the *E. Brit.* 9th ed. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; preface by W. R. Smith, 1885. (The German original in 1878 marks the inauguration of the modern 'critical' position.)
- Smith, William Robertson. *The O.T. in the Jewish Church*. A course of lectures on Biblical Criticism. 1st ed. 1881; 2nd ed. 1892.
- Kuenen, Abraham. *An historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)*. Transl. from the Dutch (2nd ed. 1885) by P. H. Wicksteed, 1886.
- Driver, Samuel Rolles. *An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.* 1st ed. 1891; 9th ed. 1913.

2. GENERAL INTRODUCTORY LITERATURE ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM

- Abbott, Lyman. *The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*. 1901.
- Bevan, A. A. *Historical Methods in the O.T.* *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909), pp. 1-19.
- Briggs, C. A. *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*. The principles, methods, history and results of its several departments and of the whole. Edinburgh, 1899.
- Chapman, A. T. *An Introduction to the Pentateuch*. Cambridge, 1911.
- Cook, S. A. *The Present Stage of O.T. Research*. *Camb. Bib. Essays* (1909), pp. 54-89.
- Driver, S. R. *The Critical Study of the O.T.* (*Essays for The Times*, No. 21, 1890.)
- and Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Higher Criticism*. 1905.
- Jordan, W. G. *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, or, The place of the O.T. Documents in the Life of To-day*. 1909.
- McNeile, A. H. *Deuteronomy, its place in Revelation*. 1912.
- Peake, A. S. *The Bible*. 1913.
- Simpson, D. C. *Pentateuchal Criticism*. 1914.
- Smith, Sir G. A. *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the O.T.* 1901.
- Smith, H. P. *Essays in Biblical Interpretation*. Boston, U.S.A., 1922.
- Sprott, T. H. *Modern Study of the O.T. and Inspiration*. Cambridge, 1909.

The 'conservative' and 'anti-critical' literature includes, in particular, the works of J. Dahse (*Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuch-frage*. Giessen, 1912; see in reply J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis*, 1914), M. G. Kyle, W. Moeller, H. M. Wiener, and especially J. Robertson (*The Early Religion of Israel*, 1892), and J. Orr (*The Problem of the O.T. considered with reference to recent criticism*, 1905); also articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and the *Princeton Theolog. Review*.

New developments in the literary criticism of the Hexateuch are noted in the commentaries. Special mention may be made of:

- Eerdmans, B. D. *Alttest. Studien. 1. Die Komposition der Genesis*. Giessen, 1908.
 Eichrodt, W. *Die Quellen d. Genesis von neuem untersucht*. Giessen, 1916.
 Eissfeldt, O. *Hexateuch-Synopse*. Leipzig, 1923.
 Smend, R. *Die Erzählung d. Hexateuch, auf ihre Quellen untersucht*. Berlin, 1912.

3. ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM

- Bennett, W. H. *Contemporary Review*, April, 1906, pp. 518 *sqq.*
 Bevan, A. A. *Critical Review*, 1897, pp. 406 *sqq.*; 1898, pp. 131 *sqq.*
 Cook, S. A. *Expositor*, 1906, June, pp. 524-43.
 Driver, S. R. *Authority and Archaeology* (ed. Hogarth), pp. 1-152. 1899.
 Gray, G. B. *Expositor*, May, 1898, pp. 337 *sqq.*
 Peake, A. S. *Inaugural Lectures by Members of the Faculty of Theology of Manchester University*. 1905.

See also on this subject the Commentaries on Genesis by S. R. Driver (*Westminster Series*, 1904), H. E. Ryle (*Cambridge Bible*, 1914), J. Skinner (*Internat. Crit. Comm.*, Edinburgh, 1910), Gunkel (*German*, 1922), and Böhl (*Dutch*, 1923); and on Exodus by A. H. McNeile (*Westm. Ser.*, 1908), and Driver (*Cambridge Bible*, 1911).

4. THE EXODUS

- Cook, S. A. *Art. Exodus (The) in E. Brit.*
 Gardiner, A. H. *The Delta Residence of the Pharaohs*. *J.E.A.* v, 1918, pp. 127, 177, 242 *sqq.*
 — *The Geography of the Exodus*. *Recueil Champollion*, 1922, pp. 203-15.
 Gressmann, H. *Mose und seine Zeit: Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen*. Göttingen, 1913.
 King, G. A. F. *Nile and Jordan: the Archaeological and Historical Interrelations between Egypt and Canaan*. 1921. (Very full bibliography.)
 Mallon, A. *Les Hébreux en Égypte*. *Orientalia*, III. Rome, 1921.
 Miketta, K. *Der Pharao des Auszuges*. *Bibl. Stud.* VIII, 2. Freiburg, 1903.
 Naville, E. *J.E.A.* II, 195. (On the stele of Merneptah.)
 Peet, T. Eric. *Egypt and the O.T.* 1922.
 Petrie, Sir W. M. F. *Egypt and Israel*. 1923.
 Spiegelberg, W. *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten*. Strassburg, 1904.
 Vernes, M. *Sinai contre Kades*. Paris, 1915.
 Wiener, H. M. *The date of the Exodus*. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1916, pp. 454-80.

5. SPECIAL WORKS

- Baentsch, B. *Altorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus: ein Wort zur Revision der entwicklungsgeschicht. Auffassung d. israel. Religionsgeschichte*. Tübingen, 1906.
 Burney, C. F. *A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times*. *J. Theol. Stud.*, April, 1908, pp. 321-52.
 — *Israel's Settlement in Canaan; the Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background*. *Schweich Lecture*. 3rd ed. 1921.
 Cook, S. A. *Critical Notes on O.T. History: the Traditions of Saul and David*. 1907. (Reprinted from *J.Q.R.*, 1905-7.)
 — *Simeon and Levi: the Problem of the O.T.* *Am. J. Theol.* XIII (1909), 370-88.

- Cook, S. A. Articles in the E. Brit. on Genesis, Jews, Palestine (History), and the several tribes of Israel.
- Eerdmans, B. D. *Alttestamentliche Studien*. II. Die Vorgeschichte Israels. Giessen, 1908.
- Gordon, A. R. *The Early Traditions of Genesis*. 1907.
- Gray, G. B. *Art. Tribes in E. Bi.*
- Gunkel, H. *The Legends of Genesis*. Transl. by W. H. Carruth, from the Introduction to the Commentary on Genesis. Chicago, 1907.
- Hogg, H. W. Articles on the several tribes of Israel in E. Bi.
- Kittel, E. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. I. Quellenkunde und Geschichte der Zeit bis zum Tode Josuas. 5th ed. Gotha, 1923. II. Das Volk in Kanaan. 4th ed. Gotha, 1922.
- Långdon, S. H. *The Habiru and the Hebrews*. Exp. Times, xxxi (1920), 324-9.
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F. *Israel: seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte*. Tübingen, 1911.
- Luckenbill, D. D. *Israel's Origins*. Amer. J. Theol. xxii (1918), 21-53.
- Meek, T. J. *Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews*. A.J.S.L. xxxvii (1921), 101-31.
- *A proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History*. Amer. J. Theol. xxiv (1920), 209 *sqq.*
- Meyer, Ed. and B. Luther. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle a. S. 1906. (Important.)
- Paton, L. B. *Israel's Conquest of Canaan*. J.B.L. xxxii (1913), 1-53. (A good summary of views.)
- *Religion of Gezer and the Israelite Conquest*. J.B.L. xxxii, 251.
- *Canaanite Influence on Palestine*. Amer. J. Theol. 1914, p. 204.
- Salaman, R. N. *Racial Origins of Jewish Types*. Transactions of the Jewish Hist. Society of England, ix, 1922, pp. 163-84 (with 12 plates). See also *Journal of Genetics*, 1 (1911), 273-92; and the *Eugenics Review*, Oct. 1911.
- Sayce, A. H. *Early Israel and the surrounding Nations*. 1899.
- *Patriarchal Palestine*. 1912.
- Seligman, C. G. *The Physical Characters of the Arabs*. J.R.A.I. xlvii (1917), 214-37.
- Smith, H. P. *Moses and Monotheism*. Amer. J. Theol. xii (1908), 444-54.
- Smith, J. M. P. *Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion*. A.J.S.L. xxxii (1916), 81-97.
- *Southern Influences upon Hebrew Prophecy*. A.J.S.L. xxxv (1918), 1-19.
- Stade, B. *Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel*. Giessen, 1899.
- Steuernagel, C. *Die Einwanderung d. israel. Stämme in Kanaan*. 1901.
- Vincent, H. *Les noms de Jérusalem*. Memnon, vi, 88-124.
- Weinheimer, H. Z.D.M.G. lxvi, 365-88. (On the entrance of the Hebrews and Israelites into Canaan.)
- Wiener, H. M. *The Religion of Moses*. Bibliotheca Sacra, 1919, pp. 323-58.
- Winckler, H. *Geschichte Israels*, I. Berlin, 1895.

6. IDEAS OF RIGHT, ETC. (above, pp. 397 *sqq.*)

- Carnoy, A. J. J.A.O.S. xxxvi, 307 *sq.* (On *rita*, etc.)
- Carpenter, E. *Early Conceptions of Law in Nature*. Hibbert J., July, 1923, pp. 711-24.
- Cook, S. A. J. Theol. Soc. ix (1908), 632 n. (On the Hebrew word for righteousness.)
- Cornford, F. M. *From Religion to Philosophy* (pp. 172 *sqq.*). 1912.

- Dauids, T. W. Rhys. *Cosmic Law in Ancient Thought*. Proc. of the Brit. Acad. (Nov. 1917), viii.
- Drummond, J. *The Righteousness of God*. Hibbert Journ. 1. 1902, pp. 83 *sqq.*
- Hall, H. R. *Anc. Hist. of Near East* (p. 304, n. 3; cf. p. 298).
- J.E.A. 1923, p. 257 *sq.*
- Harrison, Jane. *Themis: a Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (p. 526 *sq.*). Cambridge, 1912.
- Levy, I. *Divinités Égyptiennes chez les Grecs et les Sémites*. Cinquantenaire de l'Éc. pour Hautes Études (pp. 271–88).
- Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1, 2 (Index, *svv.* Arta, Ma'at).
- Moore, G. F. *History of Religions*, 1 (Index, *svv.* Asha, Rita).

CHAPTER XV

THE CONTEMPORARY ART OF EGYPT AND THE NEAR EAST

I. BOOKS

- Andrae, W. *Der Anu-Adad Tempel in Assur. Veröffentlichung d. deutschen Orient. Gesell.* 1910, v.
 — Die Festungswerke von Assur. *Ib.* 1913.
 Ayrton, E. R. *The Tomb of Queen Tiye.* 1908.
 — *The Tomb of Siptah.* 1910. (Theo. M. Davis's excavations.)
 Bénédite, G. *Miroirs.* Cairo Museum Catalogue, 1907.
 — *Peignes, etc.* *Ib.* 1911.
 Bissing, Prof. Fr. Wilh., Frh. v. *Einführung in die Gesch. der äg. Kunst.* Berlin, 1908.
 — Anteil der äg. Kunst am Kunstleben der Völker. Munich, 1912.
 — *Denkmäler äg. Skulptur.* Munich, 1906.
 — *Fayencegefäße.* Cairo Museum Catalogue, 1901.
 — *Metallgefäße.* *Ib.* 1902.
 — *Steingefäße.* *Ib.* 1904-7.
 — *Tongefäße.* *Ib.* 1915.
 Boeser, P. A. *Beschreibung d. äg. Sammlung des Museums in Leiden.* *Ib.* 1911 *sqq.*
 Bonomi, J. and S. Sharpe. *Sarcophagus of Oimeneptah.* 1864.
 Borchardt, L. *Statuen v. Privatleuten.* Cairo Museum Catalogue, 1911.
 — *Porträtkopf der königin Teje.* Veröffentl. d. deutsch. Or. Ges. 1911.
 Bossert, H. Th. *Alt-Kreta.* Berlin, 1921. (For Egyptian representations of Minoans.)
 Budge, Sir E. A. W. *The Mummy.* Cambridge, 1893.
 — *Papyrus of Ani.* 1894.
 — *Papyri of Nebseni, Hunefer, etc.* 1899.
 — *Eg. Sculptures in the Brit. Mus.* 1913.
 — *Wall-decorations of Eg. Tombs.* 1914.
 — *Guide to the Eg. Collections: Brit. Mus.* 1909.
 — *Guide to the Eg. Sculpture Galleries: Brit. Mus.* 1909.
 — *Guide to the 4th, 5th, and 6th Eg. Rooms: Brit. Mus.* 1922.
 — *Guide to the Bab. and Assy. Antiquities: Brit. Mus.* 1922.
 Capart, Prof. J. *Recueil de monuments Égyptiens.* Brussels, 1902-5.
 — *L'art égyptien.* Brussels, 1910.
 — *L'architecture égyptien.* Brussels, 1922.
 — *Leçons sur l'art égyptien.* Brussels, 1920. (Transl. by W. R. Dawson, *Egyptian Art*, 1922.)
 Carnarvon, the Earl of, and H. Carter. *Five Years' Explorations at Thebes.* 1912.
 Carter, H. and P. E. Newberry. *Tomb of Thoutmōsis IV.* Cairo Mus. Cat. 1904.
 — and A. C. Mace. *The Tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen.* 1924.
 Chipiez, Ch. See Perrot.
 Choisy, A. *L'art de bâtir chez les anc. Ég.* 1904.
 Cowley, A. E. *The Hittites.* (Schweich Lectures, 1918.) 1920.
 Daressy, G. *Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois.* Cairo Mus. Cat. 1902.
 — *Tomb of Harmhabi, etc.* (Theo. M. Davis's excavations, 1912.)
 Davies, N. de G. *Five Theban Tombs.* Eg. Expl. Fund (Survey), 1913.
 — *Rock Tombs of el-Amarna.* 1903-8.
 Davies, Nina de G. and A. H. Gardiner. *Tomb of Amenemhet.* 1915.

- Delaporte, L. Catalogue des cylindres orientaux de la Bibl. Nat. 1910.
- Erman, H. Life in Ancient Egypt. 1894. (New German ed. by Ranke, 1922.)
- Fechheimer, H. Die Plastik der Aegypter. Kunst des Ostens, 1. Berlin, 1922.
- Kleinplastik der Aegypter. *Ib.* III. Berlin, 1921.
- Frank, C. Kunstgeschichte in Bildern: Bab.-Assyr. Kunst. Leipzig, 1923.
- Gardiner, A. H. See Davies, Nina de G.
- Garstang, J. El Arabah. 1900.
- The Hittites and their Land. 1910.
- Gennep, A. v. and G. Jéquier. Le Tissage dans l'Ég. anc. Neuchâtel, 1916.
- Griffith, F. Ll. See Tylor, J. J.
- Hall, H. R. Catalogue of Scarabs in the British Museum, 1. 1913.
- Hieroglyphic Texts from Stelae in the Brit. Mus. v, vi. 1914-22.
- and P. E. Newberry. Catalogue of the Burlington Club Exhibition of Eg. Art. 1921.
- Handcock, P. S. Mesopotamian Archaeology. 1912.
- Heuzey, L. Origines orientales de l'art chald.-assyrienne. 1891-2.
- Hirschfeld, G. Felsenreliefs in Kleinasien. Berlin, 1887.
- Hölscher, V. Das Hohe Tor v. Medinet Habu. Veröffent. d. D.O.G. 1910.
- Hogarth, D. G. Carchemish I. 1914. (Later Hittite Art.)
- Hittite Seals. 1922.
- Jéquier, G. Hist. de la civilisation égyptienne. 1914.
- L'architecture et la décoration dans l'anc. Ég. 1920. See also Gennep, A. v.
- King, L. W. History of Babylon. 1915.
- Babylonian Boundary-stones in the Brit. Mus. 1912.
- Koldewey, R. Das Wiedererstehende Babylon. Leipzig, 1913. (Eng. transl., Excavations at Babylon: Mrs A. S. Johns, 1914.)
- Lacau, P. Stèles de l'anc. Empire. Cairo Mus. Cat. 1909.
- Legrain, G. Statues des Rois, etc. Cairo Mus. Cat. 1906-14.
- Lepsius, H. Denkmäler aus Aegypten u. Aethiopien. Berlin, 1849.
- Luschan, F. v. Die Ausgrabungen in Sindschirli. Berlin Mus. 1893-1911.
- Macgregor Collection, Sale Catalogue. Sotheby's, 1922.
- MacIver, D. Randall. Buhen. Philadelphia, 1912.
- Maspero, Sir G. Art in Egypt. (Ars Una series.) 1921. (Handy guide.)
- Studies in Egyptian Art. 1913.
- Manual of Egyptian Archaeology. 1914.
- Guide to the Cairo Museum (Transl. by J. E. and A. A. Quibell, 1910).
- Meissner, B. Grundzüge der altbabylon. Plastik. Alte Orient. Leipzig, 1914.
- Babylonien u. Assyrien. Heidelberg, 1920 (ch. v).
- Ménant, J. Pierres gravées de la Haute Asie. 1883-6.
- Murray, A. S., A. H. Smith and H. B. Walters. Excavations in Cyprus. (Illustrated, valuable for Minoan and Egyptian art in Cyprus. See also articles by Evans and Poulsen, p. 662.)
- Naville, E. Deir el-Bahari. 1894-1908.
- Newberry, P. E. Scarabs. 1908.
- Scarab-shaped Seals. Cairo Mus. Cat. 1907.
- Reklanara. 1900.
- Tomb of Iouiya and Tuiyou. (Theo. M. Davis's excavations, 1907.) See also H. R. Hall.
- Oppenheim, Max Frh. v. Tell Halaf u. die verschleierte Göttin. Alte Orient series. 1908.
- Pect, T. E., C. L. Woolley and others. The City of Akhenaten, 1. 1923.
- Perrot, G. and Ch. Chipiez. History of Art in Egypt, Babylonia, etc. 1882-3.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. F. Arts and Crafts of Anc. Eg. New ed. 1923.

- Petrie, Sir W. M. F. *Eg. Decorative Art.* 1895.
 — Amulets. Univ. Coll. Lond. Coll. 1914.
 — Scarabs. *Ib.* 1917.
 — Tools and Weapons. *Ib.* 1918.
 — Illahun, Kahun, and Gurob. 1890.
 — Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara. 1890.
 — Tell el-Amarna. 1892.
 — Six Temples at Thebes. 1897.
 — The Temple of the Kings. 1902.
 — and others. Abydos, I, II, III. 1902-1907.
 Prisse d'Avennes, H. *Monuments égyptiens.* 1847.
 — *Hist. de l'art égyptien.* 1879.
 Puchstein, O. and others. *Boghazkoi: die Bauwerke.* Veröffentl. d. D.O.G. 1912.
 — Die Ionische Säule. Leipzig, 1907.
 Quibell, A. A. *Egyptian History and Art.* 1923.
 Quibell, J. E. *The Ramesseum.* 1896.
 — 'The Tomb of Yuua and Thuiu. *Cairo Mus. Cat.* 1908.
 Reisner, G. H. *Amulets.* *Cairo Mus. Cat.* 1907.
 Roeder, G. *Naos.* *Cairo Mus. Cat.* 1921.
 — *Denkmäler des Pelizäus-Museums.* Hildesheim, 1921.
 Rosellini, I. *Monumenti dell' Egitto e della Nubia.* Pisa, 1832-44.
 Sarre, F. *Die Keramik im Euphrat u. Tigris-gebiet* (pp. 1, 2). Berlin, 1921.
 Schäfer, H. *Ägyptische Goldschmiedarbeiten.* Berlin, 1910.
 — *Von ägyptischer Kunst.* Leipzig, 1922.
 — *Kunstgeschichte in Bildern: Ägypten.* Leipzig, 1913.
 — *Grundlagen der äg. Rundbildnerci.* Der Alte Orient series. Leipzig, 1923.
 Schmidt, V. *Levende og Døden i det gamle Egypten.* Copenhagen, 1919.
 — *Sarkofager, Mumiekister, etc.* Copenhagen, 1919.
 Smith, A. H. See A. S. Murray.
 Spiegelberg, W. *Gesch. der äg. Kunst.* Leipzig, 1903.
 Steindorff, G. *Die Blütezeit des Pharaonenreiches.* Leipzig, 1900.
 Timme, P. *Tell el-Amarna.* Veröffentl. d. D.O.G. 1917.
 Tylor, J. J. and F. Ll. Griffith. *Tomb of Pakeri.* 1894.
 — *Wall-Drawings and Monuments of El Kab.* 1896-8.
 Vernier, E. *Bijoux.* *Cairo Mus. Cat.* 1907-9.
 Wallis, H. *Egyptian Ceramic Art.* 1898, 1900.
 Walters, H. B. See A. S. Murray.
 Ward, W. Hayes. *Seal-cylinders of W. Asia.* Washington, 1910.
 Weber, O. *Die Kunst der Hethiter.* *Orbis Pictus series.* n. d.
 Wiedemann, A. *Das Alte Ägypten.* Heidelberg, 1920.
 Wilkinson, Sir J. G. *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.* 1878.
 Woolley, C. L. *Carchemish, II.* 1921. (Mostly later Hittite art.)
 Wreszinski, W. *Atlas zur altäg. Kulturgeschichte.* Leipzig, 1914-16.

2. SPECIAL ARTICLES

- Bénédict, G. *Tombeau de la reine Thiti.* *Mém. Mission arch. française au Caire,* 1894.
 — *Tombeau de Neferhotpou.* *Ib.*
 Bissing, Prof. F. W. Fr. v. *Denkmäler zur Gesch. der Kunst Amenophis IV.* Bayr. Akad. S.B. 1914.
 — *L'histoire de Verre en Égypte.* *Rev. A.* 1908.

- Bonnet, H. Aeg. Tracht bis zur Ende des Neuen Reiches. Sethe, *Untersuch.* vii, 1917.
- Borchardt, L. Zur Baugeschichte des Amonstempel in Karnak. *Ib.* v, 1905.
- Ausgrabungen in Tell el-Amarna, 1913-14. M.D.O.G. Nr. 55, Dec. 1914 (= Smithsonian Report, 1916).
- Aus der Arbeit an den Funden von Tell el-Amarna. M.D.O.G. Nr. 57, March, 1917.
- B. M. C. The Dress of the Ancient Egyptians. *Bull. Met. Mus. New York*, 1916, pp. 166, 211.
- Capart, J. The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb. *J.E.A.* vii, 1921, p. 31.
- Carter, H. The Tomb of Tutankhamen. *The Times*, May-June, 1923.
- and A. H. Gardiner. The Tomb of Ramesses IV. *J.E.A.* iv, 1917, pp. 130 *sqq.*
- Curtius, Ludwig. Studien zur Geschichte der altorientalischen Kunst. S.B. Akad. Munich, 1912.
- Darassy, G. L'Art Tanite. *Ann. serv.* xvii, 1917, pp. 164 *sqq.*
- Costumes d'Amenothis III. *Bull. Inst. Fr. Arch. Or.* xi.
- Le Cercueil de Khuniaton. *Ib.* xii.
- La Grande Colonnade du Temple de Louxor. *Mém. Miss. Arch. Franç.* viii, pp. 280 *sqq.*
- Davies, N. de G. Mural Paintings in the City of Akhetaten. *J.E.A.* vii, 1921, p. 1.
- Work of the Tytus Memorial Fund. *Bull. Met. Mus. New York*, July, 1920, ii, pp. 24 *sqq.*
- Forsdyke, E. J. On Egyptian Arrowheads. *Proc. Soc. Ant.* 1919, p. 146.
- Frank, K. Babylonische Beschwörungsreliefs. *Leipziger Semit. Studien*, iii, 3, 1908.
- Bilder u. Symbole babyl.-assyrl. Götter. *Ib.* ii, 2, 1906.
- Gardiner, A. H. Engraved Plaques in the Carnarvon Collection. *J.E.A.* iii, 1916, p. 73.
- Garstang, J. Excavations at Sakje-Geuzi. *Liv. A.A.* i, 1908, pp. 97 *sqq.*; 1913, pp. 63 *sqq.*
- Notes on a Journey through Asia Minor. *Ib.* pp. 1 *sqq.*
- Grenfell, A. The Rarer Scarabs of the New Kingdom. *Rec. Trav.* xxxii, p. 113.
- The Grenfell Collection of Scarabs. *Anc. Eg.* 1916, p. 22.
- The Scarab Collection of Queen's Coll., Oxford. *J.E.A.* ii, 1915, p. 217.
- Griffith, F. Ll. A Collection of Historical Scarabs. *P.S.B.A.* xxii, 1900; xxiii, 1901.
- Hall, H. R. Art. Ceramics. *E. Brit.*, 11th ed. 1911.
- Art. Plate. *Ib.*
- Art. Archaeology. *E. Brit.*, additional vols. 1923.
- Discoveries in Crete and their relation to the History of Egypt and Palestine. *P.S.B.A.* xxxi (1909), pp. 135 *sqq.*
- The Relations of Aegean with Egyptian Art. *J.E.A.* i (1914), pp. 110 *sqq.*, 197 *sqq.*
- The Land of Alashiya. *J. Man. E.O.S.* 1913, pp. 33 *sqq.* (On Relations of Egyptian, Cyprian, Cilician (?) and Minoan Art.)
- Egypt and the External World in the Time of Akhenaten. *J.E.A.* vii [1921], pp. 3 *sqq.*
- The Kestiu-fresco in the Tomb of Senmut. *B.S.A.* x, 1904, p. 154.
- An addition to the Senmut-fresco. *Ib.* xvi, 1910, p. 254.
- Heaton, N. Mural Paintings of Knossos. *J. Roy. Soc. Architects*, 1910, p. 5 *sq.*; *J. Roy. Inst. of Brit. Arch.* xviii, 1911, pp. 697 *sqq.*; and in Rodenwaldt, *Tiryna*, ii, p. 215 (1912). (On Egyptian and Minoan Distemper and Fresco-painting.)
- Laurie, A. P. Egyptian Blue. *Proc. Roy. Soc.* 1914.

- Lee, T. D. The Linen Girdle of Rameses III. *Liv. A.A.* 1913, p. 84.
- Leeds, E. T. Alabaster Vases of the New Kingdom from Sinai. *J.E.A.* viii, 1922, pp. 1599.
- Lefébure, G. Hypogées Royaux de Thèbes. *Mém. Arch. Miss. Franç. Caire*, ii, iii, ix, 1886-94.
- Legrain, G. Sur quelques ornements d'Aménôthés IV provenant de la cachette de Karnak. *Ann. serv.* 1906, p. 228.
- Au pylône d'Harmhabi à Karnak. *Ann. serv.* 1914, pp. 13599.
- Mackay, P. Origin of Polychrome Borders. *Anc. Eg.* 1916, p. 169.
- Proportion-Squares on Tomb-walls in the Theban Necropolis. *J.E.A.* iv, 1917, p. 74.
- Cutting and Preparation of Tomb-chapels in the Theban Necropolis. *J.E.A.* vii, 1921, p. 154.
- Kheker-friezes. *Anc. Eg.* 1920, p. iii.
- Method of representing Hair in Wall-paintings. *J.E.A.* v, 1918, p. 113.
- Varnishes in Egyptian Tombs. *Anc. Eg.* 1920, p. 35.
- Borders of Lotus and Grapes. *ib.* 1921, p. 39.
- Möller, G. Bemalte Tongefässe. *Antliche Berichte Berl. Mus.* xxxix, p. 217.
- Murray, M. A. The Temple of Ramses II at Abydos. *Anc. Eg.* 1916, p. 121.
- Myres, J. L. Excavations at Tell Halaf in N. Mesopotamia. *Liv. A.A.* 1909, p. 139.
- Newberry, P. E. Glass Chalice of Tuthmosis III. *J.E.A.* vi, p. 153.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. F. The Metals in Egypt. *Anc. Eg.* 1915, pp. 12599.
- Funereal Figures in Egypt. *ib.* 1916, p. 151.
- Poulsen, Fr. Zur Zeitbestimmung der Enkomifunde. *J.D.A.I.* xxvi, 1911. [Egypt, Cyprus and Crete.]
- Schäfer, H. Der König im Fenster: Nachleben der Kunst von Tell el-Amarna. *Amtl. Ber. Berl. Mus.* xl, p. 41.
- Einiges über Entstehung u. Art der äg. Kunst. *Z. Aeg.* iii, 1915, pp. 1599.
- Kunstwerke aus der Zeit Amenophis IV. *ib.* p. 73.
- Altäg. Prunkgefässe. *Sethe, Untersuchungen*, 1903
- Spanton, W. D. The Water-lilies of Anc. Eg. *Anc. Eg.* 1917, p. 2.
- Speleers, L. Intailles, etc. de l'Asie intérieure au Mus. Roy. du Cinquanteaire. *Ann. Soc. Roy. Arch. Or. Brussels*, 1920.
- Studniczka, F. Der Rennwagen im Syr.-Phön. Gebiet. *J.D.A.I.* Berlin, 1907.
- Vernier, E. Bijouterie et Joaillerie ég. *Mém. Inst. Franç. Or. Caire*, 1907.
- Boucles d'oreilles ég. *Bull. Inst. Franç. Or. Caire*, viii.
- Ward, W. Hayes. Seal-cylinders. *Metr. Mus. New York Handbook*, n. d.
- Winlock, J. E. Anc. Egyptian Kerchiefs. *Bull. Met. Mus. New York*, Nov. 1916, p. 238.

CHAPTER XVI

CRETE AND MYCENAE¹

- Blegen, C. W. Korakou. Boston and New York, 1921.
 Bosanquet, R. C. and R. M. Dawkins. The Unpublished Objects from the Palaikastro Excavations 1902 to 1906. Supp. Paper No. 1 to B.S.A. 1923.
 Bulle, H. Orchomenos I. Abh. Bavarian Academy, xxiv, 2, 1907.
 Burrows, R. The Discoveries in Crete. 2nd ed. 1908.
 Childe, V. G. Date and Origin of Minyan Ware. J.H.S. xxxv, 1915.
 Dörpfeld, W. Troja und Ilion. Athens, 1912.
 Dussaud, R. Civilisations préhelléniques. 2nd ed. 1914.
 Evans, A. J. Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult. J.H.S. xxi, 1901.
 — Scripta Minoa. Vol. 1. Oxford, 1909.
 — Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos. Archaeologia, lxx, 2, 1905, cf. lxxv, 1914.
 — The Tomb of the Double Axes. Archaeologia, lxxv, 1914.
 — Palace of Minos. Vol. 1. 1921.
 Fimmen, D. Die kretisch-mikenische Kultur. Leipzig and Berlin, 1921.
 Furtwängler and G. Loeschke. Mykenische Vasen. 2 vols. Berlin, 1886.
 Glotz, G. La Civilisation Égéenne. 1923.
 Halbherr, Pernier, and others. Articles on Phaestus, Hagia Triada, etc. Mon. Ant. xii 197.
 Hall, E. H. Vrokastro. Philadelphia, 1914.
 — Sphoungaras. Philadelphia, 1912.
 Hall, H. R. Aegean Archaeology. 1915.
 Hawes, C. H. and H. Boyd. Gourniá. Philadelphia, 1912.
 Karo, G. Art. Kreta in P.W.
 Keramopullos. Θηβαϊκά. 'Αρχ. Δελτίον, vol. 111.
 Mackenzie, D. See p. 682.
 Maraghiannis. Antiquités crétoises. Candia, 1912 197.
 Perrot and Chipiez. History of Art in Primitive Greece. Eng. tr. 1894.
 Rey, Léon. Premiers Habitats de la Macédoine. B.C.H. vols. 41-43.
 Rodenwaldt, G. Tiryns. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des k. d. a. Instituts, vol. 11. Athens, 1912.
 Schliemann, H. Mycenae. 1898.
 — Tiryns. Leipzig, 1886.
 Schuchhardt, C. Schliemann's Excavations. 1891.
 Seager, R. B. Excavations in the island of Psira. Philadelphia, 1910.
 — Explorations in the island of Mochlos. Boston and New York, 1912.
 — The Cemetery of Pachyammos. 1916.
 Smith, C. and others. Excavations at Phylakopi. 1904.
 Tsountas, Chr. and J. I. Manatt. The Mycenaean Age. 1897.
 Wace, A. J. B. and C. W. Blegen. Pre-Mycenaean Pottery of the Mainland. B.S.A. xxii.
 — and M. S. Thompson. Prehistoric Thessaly. Cambridge, 1912.
 Woolley, C. L. Asia Minor, Syria and the Aegean. Liv. A.A. ix, 1922, pp. 41-56.

¹ For further bibliographical information, see P.W. s.v. Kreta.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ACHAEANS AND THE TROJAN WAR

I. SOURCES

A. *Literary*

Homer, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.
Fragments of the Cyclic Poets.

B. *Monumental*

Ancient Records of Egypt, ed. and transl. by J. H. Breasted, vol. III, pp. 136, 139, 241-56; vol. IV, pp. 20-49. Chicago, 1906.

C. *Archaeological*

Dörpfeld, W. *Troja und Ilion*. Athens, 1902.

See also bibliography to chapter XVI.

2. MODERN WORKS

Allen, T. W. *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*. Oxford, 1921.

Blegen, C. W. *Corinth in Prehistoric Times*. A.J.A. xxiv, 1920.

Chadwick, H. M. *The Heroic Age*. Cambridge, 1912.

Clinton, H. Fynes. *Fasti Hellenici*. Vol. 1. Oxford, 1834.

Dussaud, R. *Les Civilisations préhelléniques*. Ed. 2. 1914.

Evans, A. J. *Scripta Minoa*. Vol. 1. 1909.

Fick, A. *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*. Göttingen, 1905.

Hall, H. R. *Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea*. B.S.A. VIII, 1901-2.

Helbig, W. *Das Homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert*. Ed. 2. Leipzig, 1886.

Kretschmer, P. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen, 1896.

Lang, A. *Homer and his Age*. 1906.

— *The World of Homer*. 1910.

Leaf, W. *Troy*. 1912. (Indispensable.)

— *Homer and History*. 1915.

— *Strabo's account of the Troad*. 1923.

Myres, J. L. and K. T. Frost. *The Historical Background of the Trojan War*. *Klio*, xiv, 1915, pp. 447 *sqq.*

Myres, J. L. *On the Plan of the Homeric House*. J.H.S. xx, 1900.

— *A History of the Pelasgian Theory*. J.H.S. xxvii, 1907.

Reichel, W. *Homerische Waffen*. Ed. 2. Vienna, 1901.

Ridgeway, Sir W. *Early Age of Greece*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, 1901.

— *Minos the Destroyer rather than the Creator of the so-called 'Minoan' Culture of Cnossus*. *Proc. of British Academy*. 1909.

Robert, C. *Topographische Probleme der Ilias*. *Hermes*, XLII, 1907, pp. 78 *sqq.*

Sartiaux, F. *Troie. La guerre de Troie et les origines préhistoriques de la question d'Orient*. 1915.

Shewan, A. *Leukas-Ithaka*. J.H.S. xxxiv, 1914.

— *The Kingship of Agamemnon*. C.Q. xi, Jan. 1917.

Thompson, M. *The Distribution of Mycenaean Remains and the Homeric Catalogue*. *Liv. A.A.* v, 1.

(See also G. Busolt, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, vol. 1, ed. 2. Gotha, 1893; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, vol. 11; A. Holm, *History of Greece*, vol. 1 [Eng. tr.], 1894, and Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* 1, 2nd ed.)

CHAPTER XVIII

HOMER

1. SOURCES

A. *Homer*

Homer, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. [Among the most useful commentaries on the *Iliad* are those of Leaf, see below under (2), and Ameis and Hentze (ed. 2, Leipzig, 1884-5) with *Anhang* (1877-88).]

Hymni Homerici.

Vitae Homeri.

John Malalas. *Chronographia*. Book v. Ed. Dindorf. Bonn, 1831.

Dictys Cretensis. (1) *Tebtunis Papyri*, vol. 11, 268; also in Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin, 1922), 1, p. 229. (2) Latin version. Ed. Meister. 1872.

B. *Epic Cycle*

Cycli poematum fragmenta. (Ed. Allen, in *Homeri Opera*, vol. v, in *Scr. Class. Bibl. Oxoniensis*. Oxford, n. d.)

Proclus. *Chrestomathiae Eclogae*. (Ed. Allen, *ib.*)

Tabula *Iliaca* of the Capitoline Museum. Best reproduction by Umberto Mancuso. *Memorie della R. Accad. dei Lincei*, 1911. See also C.I.G. III, n. 6125, and S. Reinach, *Répertoire des Reliefs*, 1, pp. 286-7. 1909.

C. *Sources for Alexandrian Criticism*

Scholia Graeca in *Homeri Iliadem*. Ed. Dindorf. 4 vols. Oxford, 1875-7.

Scholia Graeca in *Iliadem Townleyana*. Ed. Maass. 2 vols. Oxford.

Scholia Graeca in *Odysseam*. Ed. Dindorf. 2 vols. Oxford, 1855.

Eustathius. *Commentarii in Homerum*. Ed. Stallbaum. 7 vols. Leipzig, 1825-30.

Porphyrus. *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae*. Ed. Schröder. Leipzig, 1882.

2. MODERN WORKS

Allen, T. W. *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*. Oxford, 1921.

— *The Homeridae*. C.Q. 1, July, 1907.

— *The Epic Cycle*. C.Q. 11, Jan. and April, 1908.

— *Pisistratus and Homer*. C.Q. VII, Jan. 1913.

— *Lives of Homer*. J.H.S. XXXII, 1912, and XXXIII, 1913.

— *The Canonicity of Homer*. C.Q. VII, Oct. 1913.

— *Dictys of Crete and Homer*. *Journal of Philology*, XXXI, 1910.

Belzner, E. *Homerische Probleme*, 1 und II. Leipzig-Berlin, 1911, 1912.

Bérard, V. *Les Phéaciens et l'Odysée*. 2 vols. 1902.

— *Un mensonge de la science allemande. Les 'Prolégomènes à Homère' de Frédéric-Auguste Wolf*. 1917.

Cauer, P. *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. Leipzig, 1895. Parts 1, II. Ed. 3, 1921-3.

Chadwick, H. M. See p. 677.

Croiset, M. *Histoire de la Littérature grecque*. Ed. 3. Vol. 1. 1910.

(D'Aubignac, Abbé.) *Conjectures académiques ou Dissertation sur l'Iliade. Ouvrage posthume trouvé dans les Recherches d'un savant*. Paris, 1715. (Exceedingly rare.)

- Drerup, E. Das fünfte Buch der Ilias: Grundlagen einer homerischen Poetik. Paderborn, 1913.
- Homerische Poetik. Vol. I. Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart. Würzburg, 1921.
- Trojanischer Krieg. Art. in Roschers Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Lief. 86, 87. 1923.
- Fick, A. Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform hergestellt. Göttingen, 1883.
- Die Ilias. Göttingen, 1886.
- Finsler, G. Homer. 2 parts. Ed. 2. Leipzig-Berlin, 1914, 1918.
- Giles, P. Was Homer a Chian? Proceedings of Cambridge Phil. Soc. 1916.
- Grote, G. History of Greece. Part 1, chap. xxi.
- Hermann, G. De interpolationibus Homeri dissertatio. Leipzig, 1832. (Reprinted in Opuscula, v, 52 sqq. 1834.)
- Jebb, R. C. An Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. Ed. 3. 1888.
- Kirchhoff, A. Die homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung. Berlin, 1859. Ed. 2. 1879.
- Kretschmer, P. Zur Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte. Glotta, 1, 9 sqq. 1909.
- Lachmann, K. Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias. Ed. 3. Berlin, 1874.
- Leaf, W. A Companion to the Iliad. 1892.
- Edition of the Iliad. 2 vols. Ed. 2. 1900, 1902.
- Lehrs, K. De Aristarchi studiis Homericis. Ed. 3. Leipzig, 1882.
- Luckenbach, H. Verhältniss der griechischen Vasenbilder zu den Gedichten des epischen Kyklos. Jahrbücher f. Klassische Philologie, Supp. xi. 1880.
- Ludwich, A. Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos. 2 Parts. Leipzig, 1884.
- Die Homervulgata als voralexandrinisch erwiesen. Leipzig, 1898.
- Miller, C. W. E. Chansons de Geste and the Homeric Problem. Am. J. Phil. XLII, 3. 1921.
- Monro, D. B. Edition of the Odyssey. Bks XII-XXIV. Oxford, 1901.
- Art. Homer. E. Brit., ed. xi.
- Müller, D. Die Ilias und ihre Quellen. Berlin, 1910.
- Bericht über die Literatur zu Homer (Höhere Kritik) für die Jahre 1912-19. I. Das Homerische Problem als Ganzes (Ilias), pp. 3-57. Bursians Jahresbericht, B. 182. 1921.
- Murray, G. The Rise of the Greek Epic. Ed. 2. London, 1911.
- Obst, E. Der Skamander-Xanthos in der Ilias. Klio, ix, 2. 1909.
- Patzig, E. Das Trojabuch des Sisypchos von Kos. Byzantinische Zeitschrift, xii, 231 sqq. 1903.
- P.W., Article Homeros.
- Ramsay, W. M. The Geographical Study of Homer. [A review of V. Bérard's Les Phéniciens et l'Odysée (see above).] C.R. xviii, 165. 1904.
- Roemer, A. Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik. Leipzig-Berlin, 1912.
- Rothe, C. Die Ilias als Dichtung. Paderborn, 1910.
- Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältniss zur Ilias. Paderborn, 1911.
- Scott, J. A. The Unity of Homer. University of California Press, 1921.
- Seeck, O. Die Quellen der Odyssee. Berlin, 1887.
- Shewan, A. The Lay of Dolon. 1911.
- Stawell, F. M. Homer and the Iliad. 1909.
- Welcker, F. G. Der epische Cyclus. 2 Teile. Bonn, 1835.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von. Homerische Untersuchungen. Berlin, 1884.
- Die Ilias und Homer. Berlin, 1916.
- Wolf, F. A. Prolegomena ad Homerum. Ed. 2. Berlin, 1876.

CHAPTER XIX

THE DORIANS

I. ORIGINAL SOURCES

A. *Inscriptions*

- Letter from a Hittite King to (?) Ramses II. A.J.S.L. xxxvii, 1921, p. 206, No. 14.
 Karnak Inscription. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, vol. III, §§ 574-92. Chicago, 1906.
 Medinet Habu. Inscription on Second Pylon. Breasted, *ib.* IV, §§ 62-68.
 Lex Gortynia. J. Kohler and E. Ziebarth. Göttingen, 1912.
 Argive Inscription. B.C.H. xxxiv, 1910, pp. 331 *sqq.* Commentary, *ib.*, and B.C.H. xxxvii, pp. 302 *sqq.*
 Marmor Parium. F. Jacoby. Berlin, 1904.
 The Temple Chronicle of Lindos. C. Blinkenberg. Bonn, 1915.

B. *Literary Texts*

- Homer. *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Esp. II. I, 352-4; II, 559-680; IV, 52; V, 542-53; IX, 149-56; XI, 689, 712; Od. III, 260, 488 *sq.*; XIV, 325; XVII, 443; XIX, 177; XXI, 13-19.
 Hesiod. *Works and Days*, 140-79; frag. (Kinkel), 8, 25, 109, 175.
 Tyrtæus. In Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica*: Leipzig, 1922 (Bergk's numbers, P.L.G., 4th ed. are added in brackets); fr. 1, 12 (= Hermes, LVI, 1921, p. 347); 2 (2); 8, 1-2 (II, 1-2).
 Poetae Lyrici Graeci (Bergk, 4th ed.). Alkman, 4; Telesilla, 3; Mimnermos, 9 (= Diehl, 12).
 Pindar (cum scholiis). Olymp. VII, *passim*; XIII, 14; Pyth. I, 61-66; V, 69-76; XI, 31-33; Isthm. VII, 12-15; fr. I and 122 (ed. Schroeder).
 Herodotus. Chief passages: I, 56-57, 144-7; IV, 145-9; V, 68, 76; VI, 52; VII, 204; VIII, 43, 73, 131; IX, 26-27. See also: I, 171; II, 143, 171; III, 56; V, 61, 2, 65, 3, 113, 1; VII, 94, 99, 3, 161, 3; VIII, 31, 46; IX, 73, 2.
 Sophocles. *Ajax*, 1285, cum scholiis.
 Euripides. *Heraclidae*: fr. of Cresphontes, Temenidae.
 Thucydides I, 12, 18, 1, 24, 2, 107, 2; II, 68, 3, 102, 5-6; IV, 42, 2; V, 53-54, 84, 2, 112, 2; VII, 57, 4-6.
 Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (new ed. by Jacoby). Vol. I: esp. Hellanicus 10, 16; Pherecydes 7, 39; Ephorus 8-20, 29; Theopompus 171; Timæus 42, 153.
 Diodorus. Bks IV-V.
 Strabo. Bks VIII-X.
 Apollodorus. *Bibliotheca*; esp. I, 7 (Dorus); II, 8 (Heraclids).
 Eusebius. *Chronici Canones*, Ann. Abr. 889-1060; and various passages in the *Chronographia*.
 Much material in Pausanias, but scattered: less important in Athenæus, the lesser Geographers and Mythographers, the Scholia and Lexica: very little in Plutarch.

2. MODERN WRITERS

A. *Dialect*

- Bechtel, F. Die griechischen Dialecte, 1-II. Berlin, 1921-3.
 Buck, C. D. Greek Dialects. Boston, 1910.
 Meillet, A. Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque. 2nd ed. Paris, 1920:
 esp. chap. 1-iv. (Bibliography, pp. xi-xv.)
 Meister, R. Dorer und Achäer. Abh. d. Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss., ph.-hist. xxiv,
 3. 1904.
 Solmsen, F. Vordorisches in Lakonien. Rh. Mus. xlii, 1907, pp. 329-38.

B. *Archaeology*

Comprehensive works:—

- OLYMPIA. Berlin, 1890-7. Curtius (Textband 1, 16 *sqq.* 1897), Entwurf einer
 Geschichte von Olympia: Furtwaengler (Textb. iv, 1890) and Curtius and
 Adler (Tafelband iv, 1890), Die Bronzen. See also Doerpfeld and others in
 Ath. Mitt. xxxii-xxxviii (1907-13).
 THERA. Berlin, 1899-1903. Dragendorff (Band 11, 133-76, 1903), Theräische
 Gräber—die theräisch-geometrische Gattung. See also Pfuhl, Ath. Mitt. xxviii
 (1903), pp. 1 *sqq.*
 TIRYNS. Athens, 1912. Band 1. See also *Hermes*, lv, pp. 373 *sqq.*, lviii,
 pp. 366 *sqq.*
 For SPARTA, see B.S.A. xii-xvi (1905-10): esp. xiii, pp. 107-36 (Droop,
 Early Bronzes and Pottery); xiii, pp. 137-54 and xiv, pp. 142-7 (Dickins,
 Chalkioikos); xvi, pp. 4-11 (Dawkins, 'Therapne'), pp. 18-53 (*id.*, Orthia).
 Blegen, C. W. Korakou. Boston, 1921 (esp. App. 4 and pp. 120-3).
 Blum, G. and A. Plassart. Orchomène d'Arcadie. B.C.H. xxxviii, 1914 (p. 81,
 geometric pottery).
 Casson, S. The Dorian Invasion Reviewed. *The Antiquaries' Journal*, 1, 1921,
 pp. 199 *sqq.*
 — Excavations in Macedonia. B.S.A. xxiv, 1919-21, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Droop, J. P. Some Geometric Pottery from Crete. B.S.A. xii, 1905-6, pp. 24 *sqq.*
 Dugas, Ch. Les vases 'rhodiens-géométriques.' B.C.H. xxxvi, 1912, pp. 495 *sqq.*
 — Le Sanctuaire d'Aléa Athéna à Tégée. B.C.H. xlv, 1921, pp. 335 *sqq.*
 Evans, Sir A. J. A Mykēnaean Treasure from Aegina. J.H.S. xiii, 1893, pp. 195 *sqq.*
 — The Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos (esp. pp. 103-13, 132-5). 1906. (Reprinted
 from *Archaeologia*, lxx.)
 Hall, E. H. Excavations in E. Crete, Vrokastro. Philadelphia, 1914.
 Laistner, M. L. W. Geometric Pottery at Delphi. B.S.A. xix, 1912-13, pp. 61 *sqq.*
 Peet, T. E. A Possible Dating for the End of LM III. B.S.A. xviii (1911-12),
 pp. 282 *sqq.*
 Poulsen, F. Die Dipylongräber und die Dipylonvase. Leipzig, 1905.
 Reichel, W. and A. Wilhelm. Das Heiligtum der Artemis zu *Lusoi. *Jahresheft* 4,
 1901, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Renaudin, L. Note sur la Site d'Asiné. B.C.H. xlv (1921), pp. 295 *sqq.*
 Rey, L. Habitats de la Macédoine: Période post-mycénienne. B.C.H. xli-xliii
 (1922), pp. 252 *sqq.*
 Rodenwaldt, G. Nordischer Einfluss im Mykenischen? *Arch. Anz.* 1920, pp. 13 *sqq.*
 Schweitzer, B. Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der geometrischen Stile in Griechen-
 land, 1. Heidelberg, 1917. (See review by O. Rubensohn, Berlin. *Philol.*
Woch. 1918, pp. 1154 *sqq.*) A full bibliography, pp. 10-14.

- Vollgraff, W. Fouilles d'Argos. B.C.H. xxviii, 1904, pp. 364 *sqq.*, and xxx, 1906, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Wace, A. J. B. and M. S. Thompson. Prehistoric Thessaly. Cambridge, 1912.
 Wide, S. and L. Kjellberg. Ausgrabungen auf Kalaureia: III. Einzelfunde. Ath. Mitt. xx, 1895, pp. 296 *sqq.*
 Wilberg, W. Die Entwicklung des dorischen Kapitells. Jahreshefte xix-xx, 1919, pp. 167 *sqq.*

C. Religion

- Immerwahr, W. Die Kulte und Mythen Arkadiens. Leipzig, 1891.
 Odelberg, P. Sacra Corinthia Sicyonia Phliasia. Upsala, 1896.
 Reinach, S. L'Artémis arcadienne et la déesse de Cnosse. B.C.H. xxx, 1906, pp. 150 *sqq.*
 Wide, S. De Sacris Troezeniorum Hermionensium Epidauriorum. Upsala, 1888.
 ——— Lakonische Kulte. Leipzig, 1893.
 Art. Pythaeus in Roscher (1909).
 Art. Karneia in P.W. (1919).

D. General

- Blinkenberg, Chr. ΠΟΔΟΥ ΚΤΙΣΤΑΙ. Hermes, xlviii, 1913, pp. 236 *sqq.*
 ——— Rhodische Urvölker. *Id.* v, 1915, pp. 271 *sqq.*
 Bloch, G. Hellènes et Doriens. Mélanges Perrot, 1903, pp. 9 *sqq.*
 Bury, J. B. A History of the Names Hellas, Hellenes. J.H.S. xv, 1895, pp. 217 *sqq.*
 Cauer, F. Parteien und Politiker in Megara und Athen. Stuttgart, 1890. (Exkurs, Megara und Korinth, pp. 39-44.)
 Curtius, E. Studien zur Geschichte von Korinth. Gesammelte Abhandlungen, pp. 181-210. Berlin, 1894.
 Forster, E. S. S.W. Laconia, Sites. B.S.A. x, 1903-4, pp. 158 *sqq.*
 Gelder, H. van. Geschichte der alten Rhodier. The Hague, 1900.
 Hawes, C. H. Some Dorian Descendants? B.S.A. xvi, 1909-10, pp. 258 *sqq.*
 Heidemann, L. Die territoriale Entwicklung Lacedämons und Messeniens. Berlin, 1904.
 Hirt, H. Die Indogermanen. 2 vols. Strassburg, 1905-7.
 Leaf, W. Homer and History. Pp. 329-41, The Dorian Invasion. 1915.
 Maass, E. Griechen und Semiten auf der Isthmus von Korinth. Berlin, 1902.
 Mackenzie, D. Cretan Palaces, III. B.S.A. xiii, 1906-7, pp. 423 *sqq.*; cf. *id.* xiv, 1907-8, pp. 343 *sqq.*
 Malten, L. Kyrene. Berlin, 1911.
 Myres, J. L. A History of the Pelasgian Theory. J.H.S. xxvii, 1907, pp. 170 *sqq.*
 Neubert, M. Die dorische Wanderung in ihren europäischen Zusammenhängen. Stuttgart, 1920. (See review by F. Behn, Klio, xviii, 1922, pp. 201-3.) (Bibliography, pp. 122-3.)
 Neumann, K. J. Die Lykurgische Verfassung, esp. pp. 18-27. Hist. Zeits. xcvi (N.F. lx), 1906.
 Niese, B. Die ältere Geschichte Messeniens. Hermes, xxvi, 1891, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 ——— Die lakedämonischen Periöken. Gött. Nach. 1906, pp. 101 *sqq.*
 Pareti, L. Storia di Sparta arcaica, Parte I. Firenze, 1917.
 Phythian-Adams, W. J. Hittite and Trojan Allies. Brit. Sch. of Arch. in Jerusalem, Bulletin 1, 1922, pp. 3 *sqq.*
 Porzio, G. Corinto. Lecce, 1908.
 Ridgeway, Sir W. Who were the Dorians? Anthropological Essays for E. B. Tylor, pp. 295 *sqq.* Oxford, 1907.
 Shewan, A. Leukas-Ithaka. (Bibliography, p. 240.) J.H.S. xxxiv, 1914, pp. 227 *sqq.*

Szanto, E. Die griechischen Phylen. Vienna, 1902.

Thompson, M. S. Some Notes on Homeric Armour. Liv. A.A. v, 1913, pp. 1599.

Vollgraff, W. Inscriptions d'Argos. B.C.H. xxxiii, 1909, pp. 185599.

Weniger, L. Vom Ursprunge der Olympischen Spiele. Rh. Mus. lxxii, 1917, pp. 1599.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. Die Amphiktionie von Kalaurea. Gött. Nach. 1896, pp. 158599.

—— Textgeschichte der Griechischen Lyriker: Tyrtaios. Abh. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. N.F. 4, 1900, pp. 98-99.

—— Euripides, Herakles. 4th ed., pp. 5-30. Berlin, 1908.

CHAPTER XX

HELLENIC SETTLEMENT IN ASIA MINOR

- Beloch, J. Griechische Geschichte, 1 (esp. chap. v). Strassburg, 1913- .
- Bilabel, F. Die Ionische Kolonisation. J. Phil., Suppl. Bd. xiv, 1, 1920.
- Boehlau. Aus ionischen u. italischen Nekropolen. Leipzig, 1898.
- Dörpfeld, W. Troja und Ilion. Athens, 1902. ^
- Hogarth, D. G. Ionia and the East. Oxford, 1909.
- Holm, A. Geschichte Griechenlands, 1. Berlin, 1886. Eng. tr. 1894.
- Körte, G. and A. Ath. Mitt. xxiv, 1; Arch. Anz. 1901, 1; Gordion, Berlin, 1904.
- Meyer, E. Forschungen zur alten Geschichte. 1. Die Herkunft der Ionier und die Ionsage. Halle, 1892.
- Geschichte des Altertums, 1, 2. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1922.
- Myres, J. L. Early Pot-fabrics of Asia Minor. J.R.A.I. 1903.
- J.H.S. xvi, pp. 243 sqq. (on Caria).
- Ramsay, Sir W. M. Contributions to the History of Southern Aeolis (J.H.S. 11); Sipylos and Cybele (*ib.* 111); Newly Discovered Sites near Smyrna (*ib.* 1).
- Ridgeway, Sir W. Early Age of Greece, 1. Cambridge, 1901.
- Schmidt, H. Schliemann's Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer. Berlin, 1902.
- Wiegand, Th. Siebenter vorläufige Bericht über die... in Milet... Ausgrabungen. Berlin, 1911.
- Winter, Fr. Ath. Mitt. xii, p. 226 (on Ionia).
- See also the articles on various Greek cities of Asia in P.W.

CHAPTER XXI

THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

1. GENERAL

- Burkitt, M. Prehistory. Cambridge, 1921.
 Déchelette, J. Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique, celtique, et gallo-romaine. 1908-14.
 Fergusson, J. Rude Stone Monuments in all Countries. 1872.
 Keith, A. Antiquity of Man. 1915.
 Macalister, R. A. S. A Text-book of European Archaeology. 1. The Palaeolithic period. Cambridge, 1921.
 Morgan, J. de. Les premières civilisations. 1909.
 Osborn, H. F. Men of the old Stone Age. 3rd ed. 1919.
 Peyrony, D. Éléments de Préhistoire. Ussel, 1923.
 Sergi, G. Origine e diffusione della stirpe mediterranea. Romæ, 1895.

2. SPECIAL

Africa, North

- Bates, Oric. The Eastern Libyans. 1914.
 Bertholon, L. and E. Chantre. Recherches anthropologiques dans la Berberie orientale. Lyons, 1913.
 Gsell, S. Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord. Vol. 1. 1913.
 MacIver, D. Randall, and A. Wilkin. Libyan Notes. 1901.
 Pallary, P. Instructions pour les recherches préhistoriques dans le N.O. de l'Afrique. Mém. de la Soc. historique algérienne. Vol. III. Algiers, 1909.

Balearic Islands

- Bezenberger, A. Vorgeschichtliche Bauwerke der Balearen. Z.E. xxxix, 1907, pp. 567 *sqq.*
 Cartailhac, E. Monuments primitifs des îles baléares. Toulouse, 1892.
 Guillemard, F. H. H. On prehistoric buildings in Menorca. Cambridge Antiquarian Society's Communications, xi, 1907, pp. 465 *sqq.*
 Mayr, A. Ueber die vorrömischen Denkmäler der Balearen. Munich S.B. 1914.
 Watelin, L. C. Contribution à l'étude des monuments primitifs des îles baléares. Rev. A. xiv, 1909, pp. 333 *sqq.*

Gaul and the British Islands

- Bertrand, A. Archéologie celtique et gauloise. 1889.
 Borlase, W. C. The Dolmens of Ireland. 1897.
 Chantre, E. Études paléoethnologiques dans le bassin du Rhône, etc. 1875-6.
 Coffey, G. The Bronze Age in Ireland. 1913.
 Fleure, H. J. and T. C. James. Geographical Distribution of Anthropological Types in Wales. J.R.A.I. xlv, 1916, pp. 35 *sqq.*
 Greenwell, W. British Barrows. Oxford, 1877.
 Holmes, T. Rice. Ancient Britain and the Invasion of Julius Caesar. Oxford, 1907.
 Mortillet, G. and A. Musée préhistorique. 1903.
 Thurnam, J. Ancient British Barrows. Archaeologia, xlii, pp. 161 *sqq.*, xliii, pp. 285 *sqq.*

Italy and Sicily

- Antonielli, U. La scuola italiana di paleontologia e le industrie paleolitiche in Italia. *Ausonia*, x, 1912, pp. 1 *sqg.*
- Brizio, E. Epoca preistorica. (In Storia politica d' Italia scritta da una società di professori, 1898 *sqg.*)
- Cafici, C. Stazioni preistoriche di Tre Fontane e Poggio Rosso (Prov. di Catania). *Mon. Lincei*, xxiii, 1914, 485.
- Colini, G. A. La civiltà del bronzo in Italia. *Bull. di Paleontologia Italiana*, xxix, 1903, pp. 53 *sqg.*, 211 *sqg.*
- Il sepolcreto di Remedello Sotto nel Bresciano e il periodo eneolitico in Italia. *Ib.* xxvi, 1900, pp. 57 *sqg.*, 202 *sqg.*; xxvii, 1901, pp. 73 *sqg.*; xxviii, 1902, pp. 5 *sqg.*
- Le antichità di Tolfa e di Allumiere e il principio dell' età del ferro in Italia. *Ib.* xxxv, 1909, pp. 104 *sqg.*, 177 *sqg.*; xxxvi, 1910, pp. 96 *sqg.*
- Necropoli del Pianello presso Genga (Ancona) e l' origine della civiltà del ferro in Italia. *Ib.* xxxix, 1913, pp. 19 *sqg.*; xl, 1914, pp. 121 *sqg.*; xli, 1916, pp. 48 *sqg.*
- Le scoperte archeologiche del dott. C. Rosa nella valle della Vibrata e la civiltà primitiva degli Abruzzi e delle Marche. *Ib.* xxxii, 1906, pp. 117 *sqg.*; xxxiii, 1907, pp. 100 *sqg.*; xxxiv, 1908, pp. 50 *sqg.*
- Gervasio, M. I dolmen e la civiltà del bronzo nelle Puglie. Bari, 1913.
- Ghirardini, G. La questione etrusca di qua e di là dell' Apennino. Atti e memorie della R. Deputazione per la Romagna. Ser. iv, vol. iv, 239 *sqg.* Bologna, 1914.
- Giorgi, C. de. Un gruppo di dolmen in Terra d' Otranto. *Bull. Paleontologia Italiana*, xxxvii, 1911, pp. 6 *sqg.*
- Grenier, A. Bologne Villanovienne et Etrusque. Paris, 1912. (Deals with the problems of the Iron Age.)
- Körte, G. Art. Etrusker in P.W.
- Martha, J. L' Art étrusque. 1889.
- Mayer, M. Le stazioni preistoriche di Molfetta. Bari, 1904.
- Modestov, B. Introduction à l'histoire romaine (trad. M. Delines). 1907.
- Montelius, O. La civilisation primitive en Italie depuis l' introduction des métaux. Stockholm, 1895-1904. (Corpus of illustrated material of the highest value: incomplete.)
- Die vorklassische Chronologie Italiens. Stockholm, 1912.
- The Tyrrhenians in Greece and Italy. *J.R.A.I.* xxvi, 5 *sqg.*
- Mosso, A. Stazione preistorica di Coppa Nevigata. *Mon. Lincei*, xix, 1909, p. 305.
- Necropoli neolitica di Molfetta. *Mon. Linc.* xx, 1910, p. 237.
- Orsi, P. Due villaggi del primo periodo siculo. *Bull. Paleontol. Ital.* xxxvi, 1910, p. 177.
- La necropoli sicula di Pantalica e la necropoli sicula di M. Dessueri. *Mon. Lincei*, xxi, 1912, p. 301.
- Megara Hyblaea, xxvii, 1921, p. 109.
- Peet, T. E. Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily. Oxford, 1909.
- Les origines du premier âge du fer en Italie. *Rev. A. II*, 378 *sqg.*, 1910.
- Who were the Romans? *Liv. A.A.* II, 1910, pp. 187 *sqg.*
- Pettazzoni, R. Stazioni preistoriche nella provincia di Bologna. *Mon. Lincei*, xxiv, 1918, p. 221.
- Pigorini, L. Le più antiche civiltà dell' Italia. *Bull. di Paleontologia Italiana*, xxix, 1903, pp. 189 *sqg.*
- Monumenti megalitici di Terra d' Otranto. *Ib.* xxv, 1899, pp. 178 *sqg.*

- Pigorini, L. Gli abitanti primitivi dell' Italia. Atti della Soc. Italiana per il progresso delle scienze, III, 1910, pp. 141 *sqq.*
- Perchè la prima Roma è sorta sul Palatino. Arch. storico per la Sicilia, xvi, 248 *sqq.*
- Quagliati, Q. and D. Ridola. Necropoli arcaica ad incinerazione presso Timmari. Mon. Lincei, xvi, 1906, 5.
- Rellini, U. Sulle stazioni quaternarie di tipo 'chelléen' dell' agro venosino. Mem. dei Lincei, Ser. v, vol. xv, fasc. 2, pp. 18 *sqq.*
- La caverna di Latronico. Mon. Ant. xxiv, 1917, pp. 461 *sqq.*
- Cavernette e ripari preistorici nell' agro falisco. Mon. Ant. xxvi, 1920, pp. 5 *sqq.*
- Lo strato di Grimaldi e l' età miolitica. Rivista di Antropologia, xxiii, 1919, pp. 185 *sqq.*
- L' età della pietra nella Maiella. Bull. Pal. Ital. xi, 1914, pp. 30 *sqq.*, 95 *sqq.*
- Sul paleolitico di Matera. Riv. di Antrop. xxv, 1922, pp. 85 *sqq.*
- Miniere e Forni preistorici. Riv. di Antrop. xxv, 1922, pp. 155 *sqq.*
- Ridola, D. Grotta dei Pipistrelli. Matera, 1912.
- Sergi, G. Italia, le origini. Rome, 1919.
- Stefani, E. Terni. Not. Scavi, 1914, pp. 1 *sqq.*

Malta

- Ashby, T., T. E. Peet, R. N. Bradley and N. Tagliaferro. Excavations in 1908-11 in various megalithic buildings in Malta and Gozo. Papers of the B.S.R. vi, 1913, pp. 1 *sqq.*
- Ashby, T. Xrobb il Ghargin. Report of the British Association (Manchester), 1915, p. 208. Despott, G. Tal Herba and Burmeghez Fissures, *ib.* p. 213.
- T. Zammit and G. Despott. Excavations in Malta in 1914. Man, 1916, Nos. 1, 14.
- Burton, L. H. D. The Ethnology of Malta and Gozo. J.R.A.I. LII (1922), 164.
- Despott, G. The Excavations conducted at Ghar Dalam (Malta) in July, 1916. Report of the British Association, 1916 (Newcastle on Tyne), p. 294, and (Bournemouth), 1919, p. 123.
- Excavations at Ghar Dalam (Malta). J.R.A.I. XLVIII, 1918, p. 214; LIII, 1923, p. 18.
- Hort, A. V. D. Archaeological notes on the neolithic temples of Malta. Man, xxi, 1921, No. 99.
- Keith, A. Discovery of Neanderthal Man in Malta. Nature, July 25, 1914.
- Mayr, A. Die vorgeschichtlichen Denkmäler von Malta. Abh. der bayerischen Akad., xxi, 1901, pp. 647 *sqq.*
- The Prehistoric Remains of Malta. Malta, 1908.
- Die Insel Malta. Munich, 1910.
- Peet, T. E. Contributions to the Study of the Prehistoric Period in Malta. Papers of the B.S.R. v, 1910, p. 141.
- Strickland, Sir G. Malta and the Phoenicians. Malta, 1920.
- Tagliaferro, N. The Prehistoric Pottery found in the Hypogeum at Hal-Saffieni. Liv. A.A. III, 1910, pp. 1 *sqq.*
- The neolithic burial cave at Bur-meghez. Man, xi, 1911, No. 92.
- Zammit, T. The Hal-Saffieni prehistoric Hypogeum. First Report. Malta, 1910.
- (with T. E. Peet and R. N. Bradley). The small objects and the human skulls found in the Hal-Saffieni prehistoric Hypogeum. Second Report. Malta, 1912.
- The Hal-Tarxien neolithic Temple, Malta. Archaeologia, LXVII, 1916, pp. 127 *sqq.*

- Zammit, T. Second Report on the Hal-Tarxien Excavations, Malta. *Archaeologia*, LVIII, 1917, pp. 263 *sqq.*
 — Third Report on the Hal-Tarxien Excavations, Malta. *Archaeologia*, LXX, 1920, pp. 179 *sqq.*
 — Guide to the Valletta Museum. Valletta, 1919.

Megalithic Problem

- Peet, T. E. Rough Stone Monuments. 1912.
 — Are we justified in speaking of a Megalithic Race? *Liv. A.A.* v, 1913, pp. 112 *sqq.*
 Smith, G. Elliot. The evolution of the rock-cut tomb and the dolmen. Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway, pp. 493 *sqq.* Cambridge, 1913.
 Mackenzie, D. Cretan Palaces and the Aegaeon Civilization. *B.S.A.* XII, 1906, pp. 220 *sqq.*; XIV, 1908, pp. 343 *sqq.*
 — Megalithic monuments of Rabbath-Ammon. Palestine Exploration Fund, 1911.

Pantelleria

- Ashby, T. Lampedusa, Linosa and Lampione. *Liv. A.A.* IV, 1911, pp. 11 *sqq.*
 Mayr, A. Pantelleria. *Röm. Mitth.* XIII, 1898, pp. 367 *sqq.*
 Orsi, P. Pantelleria. *Mon. Ant.* IX, 1900, pp. 449 *sqq.*

Sardinia and Corsica

- Delisle, P. *L'Anthropologie*, XII, 757.
 Duckworth, W. H. L. In *Cambridge Antiquarian Society's Communications*, XIII, 1909, pp. 267 *sqq.*
 Mackenzie, D. Le Tombe dei Giganti nelle loro relazioni coi nuraghi della Sardegna. *Ausonia*, III, 1908, pp. 18 *sqq.*
 — The Tombs of the Giants and the Nuraghi of Sardinia in their West-European relations. *Memnon*, II, 1909, pp. 180 *sqq.*
 — The Dolmens, Tombs of the Giants and Nuraghi of Sardinia. *Papers of the B.S.R.* v, 87 *sqq.*; VI, 127 *sqq.*
 Mortillet, A. de. Rapport sur les monuments mégalithiques de la Corse. *Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques*, III, 1892, pp. 49 *sqq.*
 Pettazzoni, R. La religione primitiva in Sardegna. *Piacenza*, 1912.
 Pigorini. *Bull. di Paleontologia Italiana*, XXVIII, 1902, p. 1; XXXVI, 1910, p. 152; XXXVII, 1911, p. 175 (bibliography on Corsica).
 Pinza, G. Monumenti primitivi della Sardegna. *Mon. Lincei*, XI, 1902, pp. 1 *sqq.*
 Porro, G. G. Influssi dell' Oriente preellenico sulla civiltà primitiva della Sardegna. *Atene e Roma*, XVIII, 1915, pp. 145 *sqq.*
 Sergi, G. La Sardegna. Turin, 1907.
 Taramelli, A. La Necropoli di Anghelu Ruju. *Not. Scavi*, 1904, pp. 301 *sqq.*
 — *Mon. Ant.* L'altipiano della Giara di Gesturi, XVIII, 1907, p. 5; Il nuraghe Palmavera presso Alghero, XIX, 1908, p. 229; Nuovi scavi nella necropoli di Anghelu Ruju, *ib.* p. 397; Il nuraghe Lugherras di Paulilatino, XX, 1910, p. 153; Il Tempio nuragico di S. Vittoria di Serri, XXIII, 1915, p. 313 (cf. also *Not. Scavi*, 1922, p. 296); Gonnesa, XXIV, 1918, p. 633; Il Tempio nuragico di S. Anastasia, XXV, 1919, p. 5; Fortezze, recinti, fonti sacre e necropoli pre-romane nell' agro di Bonorva, *ib.* 765; Il Ripostiglio dei bronzi nuragici di Monte Sa Idda, XXVII, 1921, p. 92.

Spain

- Bosch Gimpera, P. *La Arqueología preromana hispánica*. Appendix to A. Schulten, *Hispania* (Spanish ed.). Barcelona, 1920. (With extensive bibliography.)
- *Prehistòria Catalana*. Barcelona, 1919.
- *Ensayo de una reconstrucción de la Etnología Prehistórica de la Península Ibérica*. Santander, 1922.
- Breuil, H. Palaeolithic Man at Gibraltar. *J.R.A.I.* LII, 1922, p. 46.
- Dussaud, R. *Les civilisations préhelléniques . . . de la mer Égée*, pp. 212-14. (2nd ed. 1914.)
- Leeds, E. T. *The Dolmens and Megalithic Tombs of Spain and Portugal*. *Archaeologia*, LXX (1920), p. 201.
- *Problems in Megalithic Architecture*. *Liv. A.A.* IX, 1922, p. 29.
- Obermaier, H. *El hombre fósil*. Madrid, 1916.
- Schulten, A. *Numantia*. Vol. 1. Munich, 1914.

CHAPTER XXII

THE RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY OF THE GREEKS

1. ENCYCLOPAEDIAS, ETC.

- Baumeister, A. *Denkmäler des klassischen Alterthums*. Munich, 1885-8.
 Daremberg, C. and E. Saglio. *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*. 1881-1919.
 Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Leipzig. (Vol. III of the third edition 1920, vol. II of the second edition 1900, contain *Inscriptiones ad res sacras pertinentes*.)
 E.R.E.
 Kaibel, G. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Berlin, 1878.
 P.W.
 Protz and Ziehen. *Leges Graecorum sacrae*. Leipzig, 1906.
 Roscher. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Leipzig, 1884- .

2. OTHER WORKS

- Adam, J. *The Religious Teachers of Greece*. Edinburgh, 1908.
 Anthropology and the Classics. Ed. R. R. Marett. Oxford, 1908.
 Bouché-Leclercq, A. *Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité*. 4 vols. 1879.
 Cook, A. B. *Zeus: a Study of Ancient Religion*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1914, 1924.
 Cornford, F. C. *From Religion to Philosophy*. 1911.
 — Greek religious thought from Homer to the age of Alexander. 1923.
 Dempsey, T. *The Delphic Oracle*. Oxford, 1918.
 Dieterich, A. *Mutter Erde*. Leipzig, 1905.
 — *Nekyia*. Leipzig, 1893.
 Eitrem, S. *Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte*. Vols. I-III. Christiania, 1910-17-20.
 — *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer*. Christiania, 1915.
 Evans, Sir A. J. *Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult*. J.H.S. XXI, 1901.
 — *The Palace of Minos*. Vol. I. 1921.
 Farnell, L. R. *The Cults of the Greek States*. 5 vols. Oxford, 1896-1909.
 — *The Evolution of Religion*. 1905.
 — *Greece and Babylon*. Edinburgh, 1911.
 — *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*. 1912.
 — *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford, 1921.
 — *Outline History of Greek Religion*. 1921.
 Fehrle, E. *Die Kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*. Giessen, 1910.
 Frazer, Sir J. G. *Apollodorus: The Library*. With translation and Commentary. (Loeb Classical Library.) 2 vols. 1921.
 — *The Golden Bough*. 2nd edition, 3 vols., 1900; 3rd edition, 11 vols. and index, 1911-14.
 — *Pausanias's Description of Greece translated with commentary*. 6 vols. 1898.
 Gardner, E. A. *Religion and Art in Ancient Greece*. 1910.
 Gilbert, O. *Griechische Götterlehre*. Leipzig, 1898.
 Gruppe, O. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1908.
 — *Geschichte der klassischen Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1921.

- Halliday, W. R. *Greek Divination*. 1913.
- Harrison, J. E. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1908.
- *Themis, a Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion*. Cambridge, 1912.
- Immerwahr, W. *Die Kulte und Mythen Arkadiens*. Leipzig, 1891.
- Kutsch, F. *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen*. Giessen, 1913.
- Lobeck, A. *Aglaophamus*. Königsberg, 1829.
- Mommsen, A. *Feste der Stadt Athen im Altertum*. Leipzig, 1898.
- *Delphika*. Leipzig, 1878.
- Moore, C. H. *The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the Triumph of Christianity*. Harvard, 1916.
- Murray, G. G. A. *The Rise of the Greek Epic*. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1911.
- *Four Stages of Greek Religion*. New York, 1912.
- Nilsson, M. P. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*. Leipzig, 1906.
- Pfister, F. *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*. 2 vols. Giessen, 1909, 1912.
- Preller, L. *Griechische Mythologie*. 4th ed. by Carl Robert. Berlin, 1894- .
- Reinach, S. *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*. 3 vols. 1904-8.
- Rohde, E. *Psyche*. 4th ed. Tübingen, 1907.
- Rouse, W. H. D. *Greek Votive Offerings*. Cambridge, 1902.
- Samter, E. *Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer*. Berlin, 1901.
- *Geburt, Hochzeit und Tod*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1911.
- *Die Religion der Griechen*. Leipzig, 1914.
- Stengel, P. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*. 3rd ed. Munich, 1920.
- Usener, H. *Götternamen*. Bonn, 1896.
- Visser, M. W. de. *Die nicht-menschengestaltigen Götter der Griechen*. Leiden, 1903.
- Wächter, Th. *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult*. Giessen, 1910.
- Wide, S. *Lakonische Kulte*. Leipzig, 1893.
- and M. P. Nilsson. *Griechische und römische Religion (Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, II, 4)*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1922.

I. SYNCHRONISM

| B.C. | EGYPT | BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA | MITANNI, SYRIA, ETC. |
|------|--|--|--|
| 2900 | | Lugal-zaggisi claims to rule from Mediterranean to Persian Gulf | The Mediterranean coast-lands already intermittently under the influence of Egypt and the Mesopotamian powers (I, 225 seq.) |
| 2870 | | Sargon of Agade; campaign in Cappadocia | |
| 2800 | | Naram-Sin Sharqalisharri subdues Amor | |
| 2700 | End of Old Kingdom | Gudea; intercourse with Mt Amanus, Melukhka, etc. | |
| 2600 | Asiaties invade Egypt | Dungi; conquest of Amor, etc. | |
| 2500 | | | |
| 2400 | MIDDLE KINGDOM Eleventh Dynasty | | |
| 2300 | | First Dynasty of BABYLON ¹ | |
| 2200 | Twelfth Dynasty | Age of Hammurabi | |
| 2100 | | First Dynasty of SEA-COUNTRY Amor attacks Babylon | |
| 2000 | Twelfth Dynasty ends (?) | | |
| 1900 | | | |
| 1800 | HYKKSOS PERIOD | KASSITE Dynasty begins (1746) | Hyksos (? of Syrian origin) invade Egypt |
| 1700 | | Intermittent Assyrian power westwards. Shamshi-Adad II (1716) reaches Syria | |
| 1600 | Expulsion of the Hyksos New Kingdom Eighteenth Dynasty Ahmose I (1580) ² | | Egyptian control over Palestine; Syria (I, 315; II, 1) |
| 1550 | Thutmose I (1540) | | Mitanni in contact with Egypt |
| 1500 | Campaigns in Syria as far as Mitanni Thutmose III (1501); wars in Syria; intercourse with Keffians and Men of the Isles; gifts from Hatti and Babylonia Battle of Megiddo (1479) Embassy from Assyria (1476) Battle of Carchemish (1467) | Puzur - Ashur IV (1486); embassy to Egypt, treaty with Babylon Burra - Buriash I (1461); treaty with Assyria | Prominence of Mitanni Dynasty of Shaushtatar |
| 1450 | Amenhotep II (1447); campaigns as far as Mitanni | Kurigalzu II (1435); friendship with Egypt | Marriage relations with Egypt |
| 1420 | Thutmose IV (1420); marries Mitannian princess. Her son: | Kara - Iudash I (1410), sends daughter to Egypt. Treaty with Assyria | |
| 1410 | Amenhotep III (1411); marriage relations with Mitannians, Kassites, etc. Mention of the 'Peoples of the Sea' (II, 277). | Burra-Buriash II (1395); relations with Egypt | |
| 1400 | Height of Egyptian power and influence | Ashur - nadin - akhi (1396) receives gifts from Egypt | |
| | AMARNA PERIOD: correspondence between Egypt and Palestine, Syria, Phoenicia, Babylonia, Assyria, Mitanni, Hatti and Cyprus (?) | | |
| 1375 | Amenhotep IV, Ikhnaton (1375). Religious revolution; court moved from Thebes to Amarna; correspondence with Babylonia, etc. Powerful anti-Egyptian movements in south-west Asia | Ashur - uballit II (1381), active, raids across the Euphrates Enmity with Assyria, followed by alliance Kadashman-Kharbe (1369) suppresses Sutu bedouins Civil war (1368) Kurigalzu III (1368), war with Elam; routed by Assyria | Anti-Egyptian movements throughout Mitanni and Syria Tushratta slain by his son Artatama in an Assyrian intrigue. Mitanni, and Mattiuaza, spoiled by Assyria, and reduced to vassalage by Hatti |
| 1360 | Tutenkhaton (1360); changes name to Tutenkhamon; court returns to Thebes; tribute still received from Palestine Period of anarchy | Kassite power checked; friendship with Hatti | |

¹ A few dates are given before 1580 B.C. for the sake of reference; see further, vol. I, 656-60.² The beginning of the First Dynasty (viz. 2225, see I, 658) is now dated at 2169 B.C. by Langdon (Weidner, 2057; Kugler, 2049).³ Dates in brackets are those of the accession of a king or of an event.⁴ 7 or 1380; see II, 260 n.

NISTIC TABLE¹

| HATTI AND ASIA MINOR | THE AEGEAN | GREECE, TROY, ETC. | B.C. |
|---|--|---|------|
| | | | 2900 |
| ? Sargon I in Cappadocia (ii, 6) | | Troy: first settlement (i, 613) | 2870 |
| The Manda (? Modes): earliest traces of Indo-Europeans in Asia (ii, 15) | | | 2800 |
| | <i>Early Minoan III</i> | <i>Early Helladic II</i> | 2700 |
| | | | 2600 |
| Period of the Cappadocian tablets (ii, 257 sq.) | <i>Middle Minoan I</i> begins | | 2500 |
| | | | 2400 |
| | Egyptian influence strong in Crete | | 2300 |
| | <i>Middle Minoan II</i> | <i>Middle Helladic I</i> | 2200 |
| | Palace of Knossos | Troy: second city destroyed (i, 614) | 2100 |
| | | | 2000 |
| Hittites raid Babylonia in the reign of Shamaash-ditana (i, 561; ii, 230) | <i>Middle Minoan III</i> begins | | 1900 |
| | Cessation of direct intercourse between Crete and Egypt. Cretan culture dominant in Aegean and on mainland | Troy already in contact with Thrace, Hungary, etc. (i, 614) | 1800 |
| | | | 1700 |
| (Caro-Lelegian culture with Cycladic relations) | <i>Late Minoan I</i> | <i>Late Helladic or Mycenaean I</i> | 1600 |
| | Knossos palace destroyed and rebuilt; extensive ruin in Crete; pictographic script replaced by linear | Shaft-grave dynasty at Mycenae | |
| Murshil I raids Aleppo and Babylon (ii, 230) | Cretan influence over Cyclades and on Greek mainland | Troy: fifth city | 1550 |
| | | Troy: sixth city | 1500 |
| | | Rise of Trojan power | |
| | Keftians in Egypt (tomb of Kekhmuire) | <i>Late Helladic II</i> | |
| | | Tholos-tombs dynasty at Mycenae | |
| Dudkhalla II; relations with Aleppo, Hanigalbat, etc. (ii, 260) | | | 1450 |
| Hattushil; war on Aleppo | | | 1420 |
| Indo-Iranian traces (ii, 13, 331) | | | 1410 |
| Shubshulluma (c. 1400 ⁴). Treaties with Egypt, etc. | <i>Late Minoan II</i> , only at Knossos; elsewhere <i>L.M.I</i> passes into <i>Late Minoan III</i> | <i>Late Helladic III</i> | 1400 |
| | | Palace and citadel of Mycenae rebuilt. | |
| | Destruction of Knossos; reaction of mainland on Crete | Palace of Tiryns founded. Expansion of Mycenaean art | |
| Wars against Carchemish, Mitanni, Lebanon, etc.; helps Amor against Mitanni | Activity of Sea-peoples: Lycians, Sherden, etc. | | 1375 |
| Marries his daughter to Mattiuaza | | | |
| | | | 1360 |
| Struggles between the two sons, Arnuwaddash and Murshil | | | |

694 SYNCHRONISTIC TABLE: c. 1350—c. 1100 B.C.

| B.C. | EGYPT | BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA | MITANNI, SYRIA, ETC. |
|------|--|---|--|
| 1350 | <i>Nineteenth Dynasty</i> Harmhab (1350); treaty with Hatti | | |
| 1315 | Seti I (1314), recovers Palestine and Trans-Jordan; treaty with Hatti | Nazi-Maruttash II (1319); defeated by Assyria | |
| 1300 | Ramses II (1292) Battle of Kadesh (1288) | Adad-nirari I (1305), conquers Kassites, reaches Euphrates, rules Harran and Carchemish Kadashman-Turgu (1293); alliance with Hatti against Assyria Kadashman-Enlil (1276); supported by Hattushli | Palestine as far as Kadesh and beyond the Jordan again under Egyptian influence Bedouin tribes hinder relations between Hatti and Babylonia |
| 1260 | Treaty with Hatti (1272) Kings of Hatti and Kode visit Egypt (1259) | Kashtiliash III (1249). Overthrow of Kassites by Assyria; Elamite invasion Kadashman-Kharbe II (1240). Adad-Sum-iddin (1238) Revolt against Assyria. Second Elamite invasion Adad-shum-nasir (1232); war with Assyria | |
| 1240 | Decline of military power of Egypt. Movement from Thebes to Delta where Syrian influence increases Growth of priesthood | Enlil-kudur-usur (1207); war with Kassites | Israélite Exodus (?) ¹ |
| 1225 | Merneptah (1225); widespread anti-Egyptian revolts (11, 166) Defeat of Libyan-Levantine alliance (1221, 11, 167) 'Merneptah Stele' (11, 169) Anarchy in Egypt | Meli-Shupak I (1202); futile attacks on Assyria | Palestine revolts quelled by Merneptah. The first mention of 'Israel' (11, 320) |
| 1200 | Ramses III (1198) Defeat of the first Libyan attack (1194) Defeat of the sea and land attack of Philistines, etc. (1190) | | Traditional rise of Phoenician maritime power, and founding of Tyre (1, 157) First mention of Philistines (in Eg. text) Palestine still under Egyptian control |
| 1175 | Defeat of second Libyan attack (1187) | Kassites (under Ilbaba-sum-iddin, 1174), attacked by Ashur-ulan I (1175) and Elam (Shutruk-Nakhkhunte). Sippar sacked End of KASSITE Dynasty Pashu Dynasty of Babylon (1166) | |
| 1170 | Ramses IV (1167) Egypt ceases to work mines of Sinai | | |
| 1150 | | Important Aramaean movements | Rise of Edomite kingdom (?) 1150 |
| 1145 | Ramses IX (1142) Looting in the Valley of Tombs | Nebuchadrezzar I (1146); 'subduer of Amor,' etc. Defeats Elam, but is subdued by Assyria | |
| 1115 | Ramses XI (1118) Wentzen's visit to Byblos, etc. | Ashur-rish-ishi I (1127), suppresses bedouins and checks Nebuchadrezzar Tiglath-pileser I (1115), campaigns to Phoenicia; receives gifts from Egypt | Zakkai dynasty of Dor Age of Sisera and the 'judges' of Israel Philistine domination |
| 1100 | <i>Twenty-First Dynasty</i> Neubenedict (Smedes, 1100). Independent kingdom in Delta | Babylonian raid on Assyria (c. 1107) Period of relapse in Assyria | Cypriote-Syrian settlements become stronger Age of Samuel |
| 1000 | | Dark period until the emergence of Assyria (ninth century) | Age of Saul (? 1025) and David (? 1010) Prominence of Israel, Moab, Edom, Ammon and the Aramaean states |
| 900 | | | |

IRON AGE AND AGE

¹ For the references to biblical events, see p. 701; on the Exodus, see also p. 116, n. 2.

| HATTI AND ASIA MINOR | THE AEGEAN | GREECE, TROY, ETC. | B.C. |
|--|--|--|------|
| Murshili; treaties with Kissuwadna and Aleppo | | | 1350 |
| Mutallu (1329); treaty with Egypt | | | 1375 |
| (Persisting relations between Hatti and Amor) | | | 1300 |
| Hattushli (1289); anti-Egyptian alliance: Hatti, Mysia, Cilicia, Pidasa, etc. (II, 141, 281, 488) | | (Beginning of the Greek 'heroic age,' II, 477) | |
| Hattushli supports Kadasman-Euili; anti-Assyrian policy Hatti retain Amor in treaty with Egypt | | (Troy, independent of Mycenaean culture; a powerful seat of alien influence (II, 472)) | |
| Dudkhali III (1255); treaty with Amor; control of Aleppo | | Thracio-Phrygian culture pushing south-eastwards (II, 472) | 1260 |
| Ionia a Hatti bloc against Greece (II, 548 sqq.) | | | |
| | Period of Sea-power of Minos | Predominance of Achaeans in Greece Rise of Pelopid dynasty in Argos | 1240 |
| | Great anti-Egyptian alliance (Livyans, Sagalassians, Lycians, Achaeans, etc.; II, 282) | | 1225 |
| Increasing weakness of Hatti, owing to new peoples in north-west Asia Minor (II, 487) | | | |
| Dudkhali IV (? last king of Hatti). Hatti records cease suddenly | | | |
| Great movement of Pulesati (Philistines), Zakkal, Sagalassians, etc., against Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt | | Trojan war Capture of Troy (1183?). (? An episode in the Greek settlement of Asia Minor; II, 547) | 1200 |
| Opening up of Asia Minor after the fall of Troy | | | |
| Overthrow of Hittite power at Boghaz Keui (II, 13 sqq., 284) | | | 1175 |
| Appearance of Tubal, Meshech and other tribes | | | |
| | | | 1170 |
| Greek settlements on coast of Asia Minor | | | 1150 |
| Indications of Post-Hittite culture in N. Syria, etc., with centre at Carchemish | | | 1145 |
| | | End of Pelopid dynasty in Argos and Mycenae | 1125 |
| | | Break-up of Mycenaean empire; local styles become prominent Dorian invasions (II, 472) | 1100 |

OF GEOMETRIC ART

1000

900

II

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KASSITE PERIOD

To supplement the note on p. 229 it should be observed that the main facts on which our knowledge of the Kassite chronology is based are obtained from eight sources:

(1) The King List A (Pinches, *P.S.B.A.* 1884, p. 193), which gives the duration of the main periods and (originally before it was broken) the length of each reign.

(2) The Babylonian Chronicle P (Delitzsch, *Abh. d. Kön. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* xxv, 1906, p. 43), which contains the history from about the time of Kara-khardash (Kara-Indash II) to Adad-shum-iddin.

(3) The Synchronous History (L. W. King, *Cuneiform Texts*, xxxiv, pp. 38 sqq.), which gives the history from Kara-Indash (I) down to the ninth century.

(4) The latter part of Brit. Mus. No. 96,152 (King, *Chronicles*, II, p. 15) and the first part of Brit. Mus. No. 27,859 (King, *ib.* p. 57).

(5) The new synchronous tablets from Ashur (see Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1915, iv; 1921, II).

(6) Contemporary references in numerous letters of the period (Tell el-Amarna, etc.).

(7) References in cuneiform historical texts from Boghaz Keui.

(8) Chronological details in historical texts of the later kings.

The main evidence for fixing the dates is given in vol. I, p. 152. Briefly, we know that the rule of the Kassites lasted 576½ years, and of the thirty-six kings of this period we know the names of all but one (see vol. I, p. 563), and in many cases the number of years each reigned. There appears to be little disagreement now about the actual dating of this period; and we may, with Weidner, date the first year about 1746 and the last about 1169, but in some of the internal details we differ from him.

From vol. I, p. 154, it will be seen that Iluma-ilu, the first king of the Sea-country, was a contemporary of Samsu-iluna and Abeshu' of Babylonia, and hence, by our dating, ruled about 2070¹. Gulkishar, who came to the throne, as we are told, about 193 years after Iluma-ilu's accession and then reigned 55 years, will have occupied the throne c. 1877-1823, a date

¹ But with the alterations demanded by the new dating of Fotheringham, the Oxford Astronomer, for Ammi-zaduga (1922-1), we may have to reduce this dating, a procedure which will fit in equally well with the Kassite period (see Langdon, *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Inscr.* II, p. iii, n. 1). Samsu-iluna will thus have died c. 1987, and we may then reasonably estimate Iluma-ilu's accession at c. 2040, which will give 1847-1793 for Gulkishar, and 1682 for Ea-gamil's accession, a date sufficiently near to Kashtiliash I (1708-1687). On the new evidence for the chronology of the earlier periods, see the note on the Weld-Blundell prism in the Additions and Corrections to vol. I (2nd ed.) of this work.

agreeing well with the statement on a boundary stone (see vol. 1, p. 154) that he lived 696 years before Nebuchadrezzar I, who was a contemporary of Tiglath-pileser I (1115-1103).

We are thus able to begin to fix the Dynasty of the Sea-country with fair certainty. An additional piece of evidence is given in the Chronicle (King, *Chronicles*, II, p. 22), where Ea-gamil, who began to reign 111 years after Gulkishar's death, i.e. c. 1711, was a contemporary of Ulam-Buriash, the brother of Kashtiliash I, the third Kassite king, who came to the throne about 38 years after Gandash, the first king. It is thus possible to assign the middle of the eighteenth century as an approximately correct date for the beginning of the Kassite rule.

From this time onwards the references to the contemporary kings of other lands are frequent, especially in the new Ashur texts. One of the most important is that which makes Shamshi-Adad II contemporary with Agum I (Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1921, II, p. 13). Unfortunately this incurs suspicion, because this Assyrian king is made contemporary not only of Agum I, but of all the Kassite kings to Agum II, a period of (perhaps) nearly 200 years. A few lines later the same kind of error occurs: Nazi-maruttash I being made the contemporary of at least four Assyrian kings.

These two errors must be taken to counterbalance each other, if the statements are to be used at all. If Shamshi-Adad II is allowed as contemporary of Agum I and Kashtiliash II (but no further), there will reasonably be room to expand the superfluous Assyrian contemporaries of Nazi-maruttash I; and this will be found to be a fair way out of the difficulty.

It remains to consider whether Shamshi-Adad II was really a contemporary of Agum I, c. 1730-1709. An examination of the data given by the later chronologists shows the following three facts:

(a) Shamshi-Adad III, son of Ishme-Dagan II, reigned, according to Tiglath-pileser I, 641 years before Ashur-dan, who reigned 60 years before Tiglath-pileser, i.e. $1115 + 60 + 641 = 1816$ (I.R. 15, VII, pp. 60-71), which is a century and a half too much.

(b) Shalmaneser I (Messerschmidt, K.A.H. I, No. 13, p. 22 sq., rev. III, 32-IV, 4) says that Irishum preceded Shamshi-Adad (II) by 159 years, and the latter in turn preceded Shalmaneser by 580 years: i.e. $1276 - 1257 + 580$ for Shamshi-Adad, 1856 (-1837), a century and a half too much.

(c) Esarhaddon (Messerschmidt, K.A.H. I, No. 51, II, 12-32; *M.D.O.G.* xxxvi, p. 29) gives the date of Shamshi-Adad, 'the son of Bēl-ḫabi,' as 1014 years before himself (681-668), i.e. 1695.

It is obvious that none of these is satisfactory. Clearly, with Weidner, we must see in (c) an obvious error. It is not Shamshi-Adad I who is meant, but II; and 1695 is a very good approximation for his reign, if we are to make him harmonize with Agum I. Moreover, in (b) Albright (R.A. 1921, p. 86) with reason suggests that the 159 years has been wrongly included again in the 580, which might thus be reduced to 421; this gives the admirable result for one of Shamshi-Adad II's years, 1697. Again, in (a) Albright (*loc. cit.*) suggests that 60 years have been added twice, which would reduce the date to 1696; but this method cannot be considered satisfactory. It would be better to say boldly that it cannot be reconciled with our knowledge.

We are therefore in a dilemma: are we to accept Shamshi-Adad II as contemporary of Agum I (as the Ashur texts tell us), or are we to put him 100-150 years earlier, by the later chronology? The balance of probability rests with the Ashur texts; and until fresh evidence appears, we shall reckon one of his years as 1696, and his reign as having begun 20 years before that in order to meet the reign of Agum I, giving him 30 years altogether. With this as a starting point, which corroborates a date at the beginning of the Kassite kingdom, we have a working base for the chronology.

At the same time the period bristles with problems. It is difficult to be convinced of the existence of Burna-Buriash III and Kurigalzu IV, although it seems the better way out of the difficulty of reconciling Fragment C, rather than by giving a reign of 49 years to Kurigalzu II and ignoring the two (unfilled) places in Fragment C. In this fragment Enlil-nirari is given as the contemporary of two Kassite kings, the names of which are lost, but one was probably Kadashman-Kharbe and the other Kurigalzu III. Following him there come the spaces for three Kassite kings as contemporaries of Arik-den-ilu, and then a break; the next Assyrian king is Adad-nirari I, probably restoring the first line of the break. Obviously we have to supply the names of two kings at least before the contemporary of Adad-nirari, who, we know, was Nazi-maruttash.

Weidner was at first of opinion that Burna-Buriash and Kurigalzu should be supplied here, and we prefer this to his later restoration (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 55); Scheil (*Délégation*, II, p. 86) has published an inscription of Nazi-maruttash, son of Kurigalzu, *SHĀ.BAL.BAL* of Burna-Buriash, and Schnabel (*M.V.A.G.* 1908, I, p. 28) considers this word to mean grandson. It should be noted that the Synchronous History calls Kurigalzu *šikhru* ('babe' or 'young') the 'son' of Burna-Buriash, certainly a mistake.

The other alternative is to give a very long reign to Kurigalzu III, *šikhru*. But contracts and the Kings' List allow at the greatest extent something less than 30 years, and it is not easy to reconcile the long reign necessary. The matter must remain doubtful at present. But if only a short reign is given to Kurigalzu III, *šikhru*, it is quite likely that some of the events attributed to Kurigalzu III on pp. 236 *sqq.* and elsewhere must be assigned to Kurigalzu IV.

A brief note is also necessary on the kings of Hatti, for which see Forrer, *M.D.O.G.* LXI, 1921, pp. 29 *sqq.* Labarnash he considers approximately a contemporary of Samsu-iluna. After his period Aleppo dominated the Hatti, until Hattushil (about the third successor to him) threw off the yoke. His son (or grandson) was Murshil; from this point on we know little until we reach the time of Dudkhalla I, some time in the sixteenth century.

The Egyptian chronology for the period rests partly upon the synchronisms with the history of Assyria and Babylonia, and partly upon calculations based upon the Sothic cycle; see vol. I, pp. 166-73. On the biblical chronology see *ib.* pp. 163 *sqq.*

III

SYNCHRONISTIC LIST OF KINGS¹

| EGYPT ² | BABYLONIA | ASSYRIA | MUTANNI | HATTI |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <i>Fifteenth and Sixteenth Dynasties</i> (Hyksos) c. 1800 (?-1580) | KASSITE KINGS (36 Kings, 576½ years) ³ Gandash (1746) Agum I, son (1730) Kashtiliash I, son of Burna- Buriash, or of Agum I (1708) Ushshi, son (1686) ⁴ Abirattash, son of Kash- tiliash I (1678?) ⁵ [? Kashtiliash II (1637)] Tazzigurumash, grandson of Kashtiliash I, son of Abirattash (1636) | (CAL) Irshum III (1735?) ⁶ (CAL) Shamshi-Adad II (1716) Ishme-Dagan II, son (1686) Shamshi-Adad III, son (1661) (1636) | | |
| <i>Seventeenth Dynasty</i> (Theban) c. 1635-1580 B.C. (vol. 1, pp. 314, 664) | Kharba-shipak (1611) (1586) | Puzur-ashur III (1611) Enlil-naṣir I (1586) | | |
| <i>Eighteenth Dynasty</i> Ahmose (1580) Amenhotep I (1557) Thutmose I (H. 1545, H. 1540) ⁷ | Agum II (1561) | Nur-ili (1561) | | Dudkhalla I (1550?) |
| Thutmose II (1514) | Kurigalzu I (1536) | Ishme-Dagan III (1536) | | |
| Hatshepsut (1501) Thutmose III (1501) | Meli-shipak I, son (1511) | Ashur-nirari I, son (1511) | | Hattushil II (1500?) |
| | Nazi-Maruttash I (1486) | Puzur-Ashur IV, son (1486) (CS ⁸ , CAL) Do. Enlil-naṣir II, son? (1459) | | |
| Amenhotep II (1447?) | Burna-Buriash I (1461) | | Shamshatar (c. 1450) | Dudkhalla II (1450) |
| | (Succession presumed) Kurigalzu II, son? (1435) | (CAL) Ashur-rabi I, son (1440) (CAL) Ashur-nirari III, (1425) | Artatama, son (1430) | |
| Thutmose IV (1420) ⁹ Amenhotep III ¹⁰ (1411) (CC) Kara-indash I | (Succession presumed) Kara-indash I (1410) | (CS, CAL?) Ashur-bēl- nīshēshu, son (1406) | Shuttarna, son (1410) | Shubbiluliuma, son (1411) ¹¹ |
| (CC) Kadeshman-Enlil | Kadeshman-Enlil I ¹² (1400) | (CAL?) Ashur-rin-nīshē- shu, brother (1398) (CAL?) Do. | (Artashumara, son) Tushratta, brother (1399) | |
| | Burna (Burra)-Buriash II, son (1395) Do. Do. | (CAL?) Ashur-nadin-akhi (1396) (CAL?) Eriba-Adad, son (1396) | | |

¹ Abbreviations: CAL = Contemporary on the Ashur Lists; CC = Contemporary by Correspondence; CP = Contemporary on Chronicle 'P'; CS = Contemporary on the Synchronic History. See p. 696.

² For fuller particulars of the kings of Egypt, see p. 702 sq. The dates are those of Prof. Breasted (B) and Dr Hall (H).

³ The present scheme makes 36 kings, but Ushshi (Dushil) is omitted on the Ashur List (Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 13) and Kashtiliash II on Kings' List A, which makes 37, and the other omission is probably a usurper.

⁴ Also CAL with Ea-gamil, the last king of the sea-lands, who fought with the brother of Kashtiliash I.

⁵ Or 1535. See p. 54, also p. 86, n. 1.

⁶ This equation with Puzur-Ashur demands an inversion of the order of incidents on the Sync. Hist.

⁷ Otherwise calculated at 1450; see p. 86, n. 1.

⁸ See Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1913, p. 65.


⁹ Married Mutemuya, d. of Artatama.

¹⁰ M. Gilukhipa, d. of Shuttarna, and Tadukhipa, d. of Tushratta, and sister of Kadeshman-Enlil I.

¹¹ Made treaty with Artatama II. On the date, see p. 260, n. 1.

¹² Sister m. Amenhotep III.

| EGYPT | BABYLONIA | ASSYRIA | MITANNI | HATTI |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><i>Eighteenth Dynasty (cont.)</i> Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton) (H. 1380, B. 1375) (CC Burna-Buriash II) (CC Ashur-uballit) (CC Shubuiluluma) (CC Tushratta, in 12th yr = 1363)</p> <p>Sakere (H. 1362, B. 1358) Tutenkhamon (H. 1360, B. 1356) Ai (1350)</p> <p><i>Nineteenth Dynasty</i> Harmhab (H. 1346, B. 1350)</p> <p>Ramses I (H. 1321, B. 1315) Seti I (H. 1321, B. 1314)</p> <p>Ramses II (H. 1300, B. 1292)</p> <p>Merneptah (H. 1233, B. 1225)</p> <p>Amenmose (H. 1223, B. 1213) Ramses-Siptah (H. 1220) Seti II (H. 1214, B. 1209) Anarchy and reign of Syrian usurper (H. 1210-5, B. 1205-0)</p> | <p>Burna (Burra)-Buriash II, son (1395) Kara-khardash (or Kara-indash II) (1370)¹</p> <p>Kadashman-Kharbe, son (1369) Nazi-Bugash (or Shuzigash) (1368) (usurper) Kurigalzu III (<i>shkur</i>), son of Kadashman-Kharbe² (1368) Do.</p> <p>Burna-Buriash III⁴ (1367)</p> <p>Kurigalzu IV (1342) Nazi-Marutash II¹, son of Kurigalzu (1319) Do.</p> <p>Kadashman-Turgu, son (1293)</p> <p>Kadashman-Enlil II, son (1276) Kudur-Enlil (1270) Shagarakti-Shurilash, son (1262)</p> <p>Kashtiliash III², son (1249) Enlil-nadin-shum (1241) Kadashman-Kharbe II (1240)³ Adad-shum-iddin (1238)⁴ Adad-shum-nasir (-u⁵) (1232) Do.</p> <p>Do.</p> <p>Do.</p> <p>Meli-Shipak II, son (1202)</p> | <p>Ashur-uballit, son (1386) (CAL? CS) Do.</p> <p>(CF) Do (CS, CF) Do. (CS³) Do. (CS, CP) Enlil-nirari, son (1368)</p> <p>(CAL?) Arik-dēn-ilu, son (1345) (CS³) Adad-nirari I, son (1305)</p> <p>Shalmaneser I, son (1276)</p> <p>Tukulti-Ninurta I, son (1256) (CAL) Do.</p> <p>Ashur-nadin-apli⁶, son (1232) (CS, CC) Ashur-nirari III (1213) Enlil-kudur-u⁵ur (1207) (CS, CAL) Ninurta-apal-ekur I (1202) (CAL) Do.</p> | <p>(Artatama II of Hatti), son</p> <p>Mattiuaa, brother (1359)⁵</p> | <p>Arnuandash II, son (1358)</p> <p>Murshil II, son Shubuiluluma (1345)</p> <p>Mutallu (Muwatallish), son (1329)</p> <p>Hattushil III, brother (1289) (CC Kadashman-Enlil)</p> <p>Dudkhalla III, son (1255) (CC) Tukulti-Ninurta I</p> <p>Arnuandash III, son (1229)</p> <p>Dudkhalla IV, son (1200)</p> |

¹ See p. 235 n. Probably m. d. of Ashur-uballit.² Sync. Hist. 'son' of Burna-Buriash.³ Defeated by Enlil-nirari.⁴ This addition of Burna-Buriash III and Kurigalzu seems necessary; it coincides with Weidner's views of 1913 (*M.V.A.G.* 1913, p. 64), but not of 1921 (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 53).⁵ The family of the Mitannian Shuttarna, as at present known, can be tabulated as follows:⁶ Defeated by Adad-nirari.⁷ Cf. 'P.'⁸ Fought with Tukulti-Ninurta I.⁹ Weidner's text (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 14) gives these two kings as contemporaries of Ashur-nadin-apli. But this latter king could hardly have come to the throne until after the murder of his father, and this took place apparently a little before the time of the accession of Adad-shum-nasir (Chronicle 'P', IV, 9).¹⁰ On the variant for the name of this king (Ashur-nasir-apli) see Weidner (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 19).

701

| EGYPT | BABYLONIA | ASSYRIA | MITANNI | HATTI |
|--|--|---|---------|--|
| <i>Twentieth Dynasty</i> Setnakht (H. 1205, B. 1200) Ramses III (H. 1204, B. 1198) | Marduk-apal-iddin I, son (1187) Ilbaba-shum-iddin (1174) Enlil-nadin-akhe (1173) (1169, End of Kassite kingdom) | (CAL) Ninurta-apal-ekur I (1202) (CS, CAL) Ashur-dan I, son (1175) ¹ (CAL) Do. | | |
| Ramses IV (H. 1172, B. 1167) | SECOND DYNASTY OF ISIN ('PASHKE') (11 Kings, 134 ¹ years) Marduk-shapik-zeri (1169) | | | |
| Ramses V (H. 1166, B. 1161) Ramses VI (H. 1162, B. 1157) Ramses VII (H. 1159) Ramses VIII (H. 1157) Ramses IX (H. 1156, B. 1142) | Ninurta-nadin-shum (1152) Nebuchadrezzar I (1146) Do. | Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur (1140) ² (CAL) Mutakkil-nusku (1137) ³ (CS) Ashur-rish-ishi (1127) ⁴ | | BIBLICAL HISTORY ⁵ Eli (c. 1153 M.) Founding of Edomite kingdom (c. 1150 M.) |
| Ramses X (H. 1136, B. 1123) Ramses XI (H. 1130, B. 1118) ⁶ | Enlil-nadin-apli, son (1122) Marduk-nadin-akhe (1116) | (CS, CAL) Tiglath-pileser I, son (1115) ⁷ | | Hophni and Phinehas sons of Eli (c. 1120 M.) |
| <i>Twenty-First Dynasty</i> Smendes (Ta. 1106), Hrihor (Th. 1100) ⁸ Psibkhenno I (Ta. 1090) | Itti-marduk-balaṣu, son (1100) Marduk-shapik-zer-māti, son (1091) Adad-apal-iddin (1083) Do. Marduk-[akhe-eriba] (1061) Marduk-zer-... (1060) Nabū-shum-libur (1047) | (CAL) Ninurta-apal-ekur (1102) (CAL, CS, CK) ⁹ Ashur-bēl-kala I, son of Tiglath-pileser (1092) (CS) Do. (CAL) Enlil-rabi (1075) ¹⁰ (CAL) Ashur-bēl-kala II (1069) (CAL) Do. (CAL) Do. | | Hadad IV of Edom and Gideon of Israel (c. 1100 M.) Ahitub (c. 1087 M.) Ahiyah and Ahimelech (c. 1053 M.) Saul (c. 1025 D.) Ahiathar (c. 1020 M.) David (c. 1010 D.) |
| Painozem (Th. 1070) | | | | |
| Menkheperre (Th. 1030) | | | | |
| Amenemopet (Ta. 1020) | | | | |

¹ Weidner (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 7) considers that a fragmentary text giving a series of numbers (which represent the length of kings' reigns) should be used about this point. The numbers are 27, 35, 10, 12, 13, 10, [17] which, with the exception of the reign of Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur (3 years) can be made to fit admirably.

¹ The dates are those of Driver (D.), and E. Meyer (M.).

* All these three kings are contemporaries of Nebuchadrezzar on the Ashur fragment D (Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1915, p. 3); on another (*M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 15) Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur is contemporary of Maruduk-shapik-zeri, and Ninurta-nadin-abum of Ashur-reh-lahi. But in view of Tiglath-pileser's statement (King, *Annals*, 94) that Ashur-dan attained a ripe old age, a long reign must certainly be postulated for him, and it seems best to ignore the synchronisms of the second list. (Cf. *M.V.A.G.* 1915, p. 70, n. 4.)

⁴ See p. 703, n. 1.

⁴ On this date and the duration of Tiglath-pileser's reign see Weidner, *M.V.A.G.* 1921, p. 9.

* Ta. and Th. refer to the Tanites and the Thebans respectively; see p. 703.

⁷ Married d. of Adad-apal-iddin.

IV

LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS

DYNASTIES XVIII-XXI: c. 1580-947 B.C.

In the first column variant transliterations are given in brackets. The second column contains the Greek transliterations (Manetho); the forms in *italics* are from contemporary cuneiform sources. The dates in the third column are those of Dr Hall (who adopts the higher Sothic limit, see *C.A.H.* I, 168), those of Prof. Breasted (who prefers the lower Sothic limit) being in brackets.

EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY: c. 1580-1322 B.C.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Nebpehtire Ahmose (I'ahmasēs, Aahmes) I | Amosis ^ | 1580-1558 | |
| Zoserkere Amenhotep (Amonhatpe) I | Amenophis | 1558-1545 | } (1557-1501, B) |
| 'Okheperkere Thutmose (Thutmasēs) I | Tethmosis | 1545-1514 | |
| 'Okhepernere Thutmose II | Khebron | 1514-1501 | } (1501-1477, B) |
| Makere Hatshepsut | Amensis | 1501-1479 | |
| Menkheperre Thutmose III | <i>Manakhbiria</i> , Mephres | 1479 (1501) ¹ -1447 | |
| 'Okheperure Amenhotep II, Hikuas | Amenophis | 1447-1420 | |
| Menkheperure Thutmose IV | 'Touthmosis | 1420-1412 | |
| Nebmare Amenhotep III | <i>Nimmuriya</i> , Horos | 1412-1376 (1411-1375, B) | |
| Neferkheperure Ikhnaton (Akhenaton, etc.) Amenhotep IV | <i>Napkhururiya</i> | 1380-1362 | |
| Smenkhkhere (S'akere) | Akenkheres | 1362-1360 | } (1375-1350, B) |
| Nebkheperure Tutenkhamon | <i>Bibkhururiya</i> , Khebres | 1360-1350 | |
| Kheperkheperuirimare Ai II | Akherre | 1350-1346 | |

NINETEENTH DYNASTY: c. 1346-1210 B.C.²

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Zoserkheperure Harmhab (Hotemehbe) | Harmais | 1346-1322 (1350-1315, B) |
| Menpehtire Ramses I | Menophres | 1321 (1315-1314, B) |
| Menmare Seti I | Sethōs | 1321-1300 (1314-1292, B) |
| Uesermare' Setepnere' Ramses II | <i>Ushmuariya Satepna-riya Riyamasasa</i> , Ramesses | 1300-1233 (1292-1225, B) |

¹ See p. 60, n. 2.² Other historians (apart from Breasted) begin the Nineteenth Dynasty with Ramses I.

LIST OF EGYPTIAN KINGS

703

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| Merneptah Hotep(hi)rma | Amenophath | 1233-1223 |
| Amenmose (Amonmeses) | | (1225-1215, B) |
| | | 1223-1220 |
| | | (1215, B) |
| Ramses-Siptah (and Queen Tausret) | Thouōris | 1220-1214 |
| Seti II Merneptah | Sethōs | 1214-1210 |
| | | (1209-1205, B) |

ANARCHY; REIGN OF A SYRIAN USURPER 1210-1205 (1205-1200, B) B.C.

TWENTIETH DYNASTY: c. 1205-1100 B.C.

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Setnakht | 1205-1204 |
| | (1200-1198, B) |
| Ramses III, Hīkon | 1204-1172 |
| | (1198-1167, B) |
| Ramses IV | 1172-1166 |
| | (1167-1161, B) |
| Ramses V | 1166-1162 |
| | (1161-1157, B) |
| Ramses VI | 1162-1159 |
| Ramses VII | 1159-1157 |
| Ramses VIII | 1157-1156 |
| Ramses IX | 1156-1136 |
| | (1142-1123, B) |
| Ramses X | 1136-1130 |
| | (1123-1121, B) |
| Ramses XI (B, XII) ¹ | c. 1130-1100 |
| | (1118-1090, B) |

TWENTY-FIRST DYNASTY: c. 1100-942 (1090-945, B) B.C.

| <i>Tanites</i> | | <i>Thebans</i> | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--|--------------|
| Nesubanebde (Smendes) | c. 1100-1090 | Hrihor | c. 1100-1095 |
| Psibkhenno I | 1090-1070 | (Paiankh, high-priest c. 1095) | |
| | | Painozem I | 1070-1030 |
| | | Menkheperre | 1030-1020 |
| Amenemopet | 1020-970 | (high-priest c. 1050-1000) | |
| | | (Nesubanebde, high-priest c. 1000-999) | |
| Siamon | 970-950 | (Painozem II, high-priest c. 999-954) | |
| Hor-Psibkhenno | 950-947 | Psibkhenno II | 954-942 |

¹ From an inscription published by Maspero in 1910 (*Annales du Service*, x, p. 131) it is now known that Ramses 'XII' should really be numbered XI (Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 389, n. 2).

V

LEADING DATES IN EARLY GREEK HISTORY

ACCORDING TO THE COMPUTATION OF ERATOSTHENES

The methods by which Greek chronologists arrived at dates for early Greek history will be touched on in vol. III in connection with the date of the First Olympiad. The chronology of Eratosthenes (based principally on the succession of the Spartan Kings) is only one of several systems, the differences between which are indicated by their divergencies as to the Trojan era (see above, p. 479). Based as they all are on genealogies and assumptions as to the length of a generation, none of them can claim accuracy.

- Cadmus, 1313 B.C.
- Heracles, 1261-1209.
- Argonautic Expedition, 1225.
- First War of Argos with Thebes, 1213.
- Second War of Argos with Thebes, 1198.
- Accession of Agamemnon at Mycenae, 1200.
- Trojan War, 1192-1183.
- Greek settlement at Salamis in Cyprus, 1176.
- Thessalians occupy Thessaly, 1124.
- Return of Heraclidae, and Dorian invasion, 1104.
- Greek settlement of Lesbos, 1053.
- Ionic migration, 1044.
- Foundation of Cyme, 1033.
- Foundation of Smyrna, 1015.

GENERAL INDEX

In this index the more correct transliteration of names has often been indicated. Attention is drawn to the remarks in the Preface of vol. 1, p. ix *sq.*, and below, on the letters *A*, *D*, etc., where also reference is made to systems of transliteration other than that adopted here. The forms in brackets include technical transliterations, alternative spellings, other forms, and identifications.

The alphabetical arrangement ignores such prefixes as Gulf, Mt, Tell ('mound'), Wadi ('torrent,' 'valley'), and the Arabic article (el-). For references to the maps see the index below, pp. 741-748.

The biblical references are collected separately, see p. 749.

A. In transliterations the *spiritus lenis* is generally omitted; but ' (which in Greek we transliterate by *h*) represents the characteristic and important Semitic (and Egyptian) guttural 'ain (ʾ). *A* is used in Egyptian by some writers for ' , ' , and even *i* (the latter seems to have covered both ' and the consonantal *y*). The Arabic vowel *ā* (*fatḥa*) is frequently pronounced *e*, as in the article *el-* for *al-*. (Before dentals, sibilants and *l*, *n*, *r*, this *i* is assimilated to the following consonant.) *ei* is used for the Arabic diphthong *ai*.

Aahmes (Iahmases, Ahmose, Amosis; Neb-pehtire'), 209, 214; and the Hyksos, 40, 151; recovers Nubia, 40; death of, 53; at Sharuhēn, 67; see vol. 1, p. 315

Aaron, 353, 363 *sq.*, 371

Aaronites, 395

Abantes, 481

Abbi-Teshub, 262, 318

Abd-Ashirta (Ashratum, Ashrata, etc.), 107, 123, 136, 299, 382; Amarna Letters, references in, 302-305, 312 *sq.*, 334, 342, 348, 356

Abdera, 621

Abdi-Khiba, 332, 357, 384, 400 (*and n.*); Amarna Letters, references in, 124, 135, 299, 312, 315-317, 321, 324, 328, 335, 338, 342 *sq.*, 346, 398 *sq.*; and the Habiru, 299, 312, 315, 317, 356

Abdi-Tirshi, 311, 357

Abel (city), 369

Abeshlaya, 249

Abiathar, 371, 373, 395

Abiezer, 370, 387

Abihu, 363

Abijah (Abiyah), 363

Abimelech, 359, 388, 392

Abimilki, of Tyre, 306, 312; Amarna Letters, references in, 311, 322, 324, 333, 338, 341 *sq.*, 396

Abina, 262

Abner, 290, 372 *sq.*, 391

Abraham (Abram), 346, 352, 357, 359 *sq.*, 384 *sq.*, 389, 392, 397

Abisalom, 373 *sq.*

Abū Simbel, 138, 147, 151, 153, 155

Abydos (Asia Minor), 552, 560; (Egypt), 49, 78, 138, 140, 147, 154, 170, 209; Osiris-temple, 59; temple of Seti I, 410, 413

Acarnania, 480, 520

Accho, 125, 302, 305, 313, 315, 319, 325 *sq.*, 332, 376, 399

Achaea, 532

Achaean Greece, 473-486

Achaean, identified with Akaiwasha (Ek-wesh), *q.v.*, and (?) with Hivites, 380 *n.*; practise cremation, 447; A. and Trojan War, Ch. xvii; rise of, 473 *sq.*; theory of foreign origin, 474; expansion of, 475, 507; Homeric Catalogue, 481 *sq.*; society, 483 *sqq.*; armour, 484, see Ch. xviii; writing, 508; A. and Dorian invasion, 518, 535 *sq.*; transitional period, 520 *sqq.*

Achaemenid dynasty, 25

Achaia (Ialysus), 537

'Acheulian' culture, 579, deposits in Spain and Portugal, 585

Achilles, 18, 30, 460, 482, 491, 494 *n.*, 495, 518; in the *Iliad*, 498 *sqq.*, 505, 511 *sq.*, 627; shield of, 515

Achish, 287, 289, 332, 392

Achor, 389

Achshaph, 315, 326, 335

Acraea, 604

Acre, 72

Actaeon, 620

Adad (Addu), 250 *sq.*, 332 (see 1, p. 231), 337, 341, 348-351, 377, 402, 404

- Adada, 16
 Adad-nirari, 231, 330, 377
 — I, 237, 238 *sq.*, 310
 Adad-shum-iddin, 243
 Adad-shum-našir, 243
 Adapa, 346
 Adaush, 250
 Addu; *see* Adad
 Addu-dani, 388
 Addu-ram, 349
 Admetus, 481
 Adōnāy, 353 *n.*
 Adōnfrām, 349
 Adonis, 347 *sq.*, 615, 638
 Adōni-zedek, 357, 397
 Adōraim, 326
 Adoram, 349
 Adramyttium, 488, 495, 552
 Adrastus, 477
 Adriatic Sea, coast peoples, 5; new-comers
 on A. coast, 26; culture, 530
 Acacidae, 602
 Aeacus, 496, 628
 Aedui, 35
 Aegaleos, 481
 Aegean culture, in Syria, 57, 330; influence
 of Egyptian art, 97 *sq.*; A. architecture,
 in Palestine, 293; art—in Syria, 329,
 Palestine, 376, Cyprus, 427
 Aegean Sea, physical changes, 20; Phoeni-
 cians, 57; Thutmose III, 78, 80; Greek
 migration towards, 164; Keftians, 275;
 see Philistines; Mycenaean power in, 459;
 islands, reduced by Minos, 475
 Aegeans (pre-Hellenic), 173, 277 *n.*, 320;
 sea-power, 302; colonies—in Egypt, 378,
 Palestine, 379
 Aegimius, 526 *sq.*, 532, 534
 Aegina, 459, 479, 481, 534
 Aegium, 479
 Aeneas, 36, 487
 Aeolians in Asia, 17, 518, 536; Smyrna, 18;
 Greece, 30, 535 *sq.*
 'Aeolic' dialect, 467, 520; distribution, 509,
 518 *sq.*
 — migration, 496, 518, 544
 Aeolus, 496
 Aepyridae, 536
 Aepytus, 533, 627
 Aeschylus, 602
 Aesepus river, 488
 Aestii, 38
Aethiopia, the, 500 *sq.*
 Aetolia, 459, 477, 480
 Aetolians, 518 *sq.*, 531, 602
 Afghanistan, 6
 Afri, 328
 Africa, interrelations with Asia and Europe,
 Ch. 1; origin of name, 328; (northern)
 prehistoric civilization, 578–581
 Agabtakha, 242
 Agamemnon, 477, 479, 497, 518, 532, 539,
 626; extent of power, 482 *sq.*; A. and
 Troy, 491 *sqq.*; and the *Iliad*, 498 *sqq.*,
 511 *sq.*, 536
 Aglauros, 611
agora, Achaeans, 483
 Agriculture and the Wiro, 29
Agrionia, 621
 Ahāb, 396
 Ahijah (Ahiyah), 349; *see* Akhi-yah
 Ahmar, Tell, 255
 Ahmose; *see* Aahmes
 — son of Ebana, 41 *sq.*, 59
 — princess, 54, 60
 Ahōliāb, 364, 396
 Ahura-mazda, 400, 401 *n.*
 Ai, city, 353, 389
 Ai, king of Egypt; *see* Eye
Aidos, 625
 Aigialeis, 536
 Aijalon (Ayyālōn), 165, 312, 314, 346
 Aitakkama, 263, 301, 310; *see* Itakama
 'Ain Shems, 294
 Ajax, 510, 628; (son of Oileus), 480, 492;
 (son of Telamon), 481, 492
 'Ajlūn, Jebel, 312
 'Akaba, gulf of, 353, 361 *sq.*, 365, 381
 Akaiwasha (Akaiwasha or Ekwehsh), the, 8,
 167, 275 *sq.*, 278, 282, 292, 475; the
 name, 282 *sq.*, 537; *see* Achaeans
 Akarsallu, 239, 244, 251
 Akhenaton; *see* Ikhnaton
 Akhetaton (Amarna), 114 *sq.*, 122, 125,
 127 *sq.*, 132, 204 *sq.*, 206 *sq.*, 336
 Akhi-yah(-yawī), 349, 404
 Akhlamū, Akhlamē, 238, 240, 248, 299,
 320
 Aki-izzi, 107, 263, 310–312, 339, 340 *sq.*,
 345
 Akit-Teshub, 262, 301 *sq.*, 308, 310, 322
 'Akkā ('Akkō, Accho, *q.v.*), 376
 Akkad, 242 *sq.*, 251, 429
 Akserai, 259
 Alabastropolis, 131
 Alaja; *see* Euyuk
 Alāki, Wadi, 139 *sq.*
 Alalcomenae, 635
 Alarodians, the, 259
 Alasa, 174, 194, 319, 335; *see* Alashiya,
 Alasa
 Alashiya, 78, 94, 96, 98, 267, 281, 282, 284,
 301, 321, 329, 343, 427, 547; *see* Alasa,
 Alshe
 Alava, 589
 Albania, 26
 Albanian language, 17, 26; in Italy, 24;
 modern, 25
 Alcman, 539
 Alcores, the, 589
 Aleian Plain, 546
 Aleppo, 76, 141 *sq.*, 145, 147, 230, 232, 238,

- 240, 260, 262, 264, 266 *sq.*, 272, 299, 301, 310, 318
 Alesa, 281; *see* Alasa
 Aletes, 529 *sq.*, 534, 538
 Alexander the Great, 3, 628
 Alexandretta, 56
 Alexandria, 277 *n.*; critical school of, 502 *sq.*, 516
 Algarve, megalithic tombs in, 588
 Algeria, prehistoric remains in, 579 *sq.*
 Alghero, 582
 'Ali Baba,' 84
 Allenby, Lord, at Megiddo, 69, 72
 Allumiere tombs, 571
 Almeria, megalithic tombs, 588; 'El Argar' culture, 589 *sq.*
 Alpera, rock-painting at, 586
 Alphabet, Greek, 508, 546; in Crete, 29 *sq.*; Phoenician, 29 *sq.*, 546; Latin, origin of, 37; Semitic, 333 *sq.*
 Alpheus, river, 477, 479 *sq.*, 541
 'Alpine' race-type, 22
 Alps, the, and the river Po, 20
 Alshe, 237 *sq.*, 261, 299, 301, 302; *see* Alashiya, Alzi
 Altamira, rock-paintings at, 585
 Althaemenes, 529
 Alus, 618
 Alyattes, 332
 Alybe, river, 5, 492
 Alzi (= Alshe, *q.v.*), 237, 242, 247 *sqq.*
 Amada, 137
 Amadai, the, 15
 Amalekites, the, 361 *sq.*, 365, 391
 Amana, 340; *see* Amon
 Amanappa, 304 *sq.*, 323
 Amanus, 3, 123, 230, 255
 'Amarna, Tell el-, 6, 138, 206, 336; city, 114, 115, 204, 298; cemetery, 116 *sq.*, 323; Aton-hymns, 117 *sqq.*, 206; decay of city, 128; portrait of Ikhnaton, 411; sculpture, 412; *see* Akhetaton
 Amarna Age: Hatti and Mitanni, 297-302, 331; Babylonian language in, 334; and the Exodus, 356 *n.*, 385, 403; A. movement in art, 420; pottery, 464
 Amarna Letters, 8, 55 *n.*, 92 *n.*, 94 *sq.*, 128, 142, 228, 237, 255 *sq.*, 259, 262 *sq.*, 278, 281 *sq.*, 296, Ch. XIII *passim*, 319 *sq.*; historical value, 318, 321, 338, 356, 381; O.T. parallels, 357, 388, 396, 398; and the Habiru (*q.v.*), 369
 'Amāsā, 373
 Amaisis, 295
 Amazons, the, 4, 544, 548, 552, 553, 581 *n.*; queen of, 500
 Amblada, 16
 Amen-em-hab, 77, 83 *sq.*
 Amen-em-het I, 228; III, 411
 Amenhotep I (Zoserkere), 53 *sqq.*, 75, 102, 159, 209
 Amenhotep II ('Okheperure', Hīkua), 191, 232, 277, 310, 330, 415; co-regent with Thutmose III, 86; sole ruler, 88-91
 — III (Nebma're), 93-108, 111 *sq.*, 121, 136, 138, 162, 167, 169, 191, 195, 205, 264, 272, 277, 280, 298, 300, 303, 356 *n.*, 410; mortuary temple, 102; 'month' of, 105; his son, 109, 113; A. and Mitanni, 233 *sq.*; Amarna Letters, 310-313, 345
 — IV (Neferkheperure'), 109, 203 *sq.*, 232, 234, 255, 263, 297, 300; *see* Ikhnaton
 — (high-priest of Amon), 189 *sq.*
 — (son of Hapu), architect, 99, 411
 Amenmeses (Amenmose), 170
 Amenope, 526
 'Amḳi, 123, 309 *sq.*
 Ammaush, 250
 Anmīa, 309, 327, 337
 Ammianus Marcellinus, 26
 Ammon (Palestine), 352, 365, 366, 370, 372 *sq.*, 388, 394
 — (Libyan), 579
 Amon, god, 48, 71, 75, 95, 173, 209, 279, 340, 344 *sq.*, 347, 351; at Thebes, 49, 90, 137, 140; temple restored by Thutmose I, 59; 'paradise of,' 62; Valley of Kings, 64; Thutmose III, 72, 209, 328; wealth of A., 73, 79, 81; Syrian temples of, 89; Amenhotep III, 101 *sq.*; conception modified by imperial power, 110 *sq.*; conflict of A. priesthood with Aton, 112 *sqq.* (*see* Ikhnaton); rehabilitation of, 128 *sq.*, 131 *sq.*; Ramses II, 142; power of priesthood, 157 *sq.*, 182 *sq.*; temple of Ramses III in Syria, 177, 183; fleet of A., 178; Medinet Habū, 178 *sqq.*, 183; priesthood supreme in Egypt, 189 *sqq.*, 209; Amon-Re-Horus, 203 *sq.*, = Amana, 340
 Amon-Re, 50, 344, 349, 351, 580
 Amor, Amorite(s) (Amurru), 56, 150, 154, 174 *sqq.*, 230, 238, 262, 264 *sq.*, 268, 284, 293, 299, 310, 320 *sq.*, 332, 382; kingdom on the Orontes, 123, 136; Amarna Letters, references in, 302-309; Hittite connection, 319; in O.T., 357, 366, 367, 371, 373, 388 *sq.*; A., application of term, 376 *n.*; culture, 377
 Amor, god, 348
 Amorgos, 582
 Amos, 396
 Amphictyony, Delphic, 033, 040
 Amphipolis, 628
 Amur-ba'al, 309, 335
 Amyclae, 455, 539 *sq.*
 Amythaon, 477 *n.*
 Anah, 250
 'Anākim, 367, 373
 Anal, 250
 'Anāth, goddess, 154, 159, 347, 397

- Anatolia: Hittite empire, records of, 2, 230, 428 n.; rivers, 4; shepherds, 5 *sq.*; Celts, 36; monuments, 255; *Kheta*, 280 (*see* Hittites); peoples of, 281; religion, 288; birch-bark of, 424; Babylonian culture in, 428; art, 430; Greek settlement in, 543 *sq.*; 'Caro-Lelegian' civilization, 553-558
- Anaxagoras, 642
- Anchises, 287
- Aneona, 35
- Ancyra, 35, 254
- Andromache, 488
- Andromeda, 288, 478
- Andron, 528
- Andros, 20
- Aneyzeh, the, 235
- Anghelu Rujū, 582
- Ani, 414; Maxims of, 222
- Animals in the religion of Egypt, 159; Greece, 618, 622 *sq.*
- Anney, lake, pile-dwellings, 591
- Ansariyeh, 263
- Anta da Capella, 588
- Antandrus, 488, 496
- Antequera, 588
- Anthedon, 481
- Anthesteria*, 611, 629
- Anthos, 620
- Anti-Lebanon, 55, 57
- Antioch, 123, 255
- Antipater (Hered.), 393
- Anti-Taurus, 2, 272; monuments, 255
- Anu, god, 250, 397
- Anubis, 201, 345
- Anubis and Bet, Story of, 223
- Anzan, 242 n.
- Apamea, 3, 554
- Apatūria*, the, 545, 640
- Apennines, the, 35 *sq.*
- Aphidna, 534 n.
- Aphrodite, 500, 516, 538, 604, 616, 617; Cytherea, 638
- Apis (Osiris), 209
- Apollo, 611, 620, 622, 624, 626; = Resheph, 347; at Miletus, 544; in Asia Minor, 552; Agueus, 633; Alahiotas (Alasiotas), 281; Carnean, 633; (Clarian), 547; Delphinus, 634; Erythibios, 633; Hegemon, 634; Kouroos, 633; Kourotrophos, 633; Ktiestes, 634; Lycius, 632; Naxiotas, 634; (Olympian), 485 *sq.*, 516, 632 *sq.*, 637; Parapioios, 633; Patroos, 633; Pythaeus (Pythius), 525, 534 *sq.*, 633; Sitalcas, 633; (Sminthian), 488, 496, 498; Triopios, 633
- Apollonia (Pontica), 560
- Apophis, 215
- Apries, 295
- Apriu, the, 328, 357
- Apulia, 563, 567 n.
- Arabia, northern plateau, 55 *sq.*; caravans from, 502; language, etc., 333; culture, 380
- Arabian Nights*, 105
- Arād, 365
- Arad-sibitti, 246
- Aral Sea, 32
- Aralar, 589
- 'Arām, 369
- Arameans, 56, 229, 299, 302, 369, 377 *sq.*; Jacob's wives, 359, 368; A. origin of Israel, theory of, 405; *see* Habiru
- Aramaic dialects, 333 *sq.*, 336
- Arandas; *see* Arnuwandash
- Araunah, 374, 396
- Araziqi, 250
- Arbor Low, stone circles at, 594
- Arcadia, 467, 476, 518, 602, 637
- Arcadian dialect, 520; in Cyprus, 18, 509, 520; settlers—in Cyprus, 29, 536 *sq.*, 546; in Greece, 29; in the Peloponnese, 467, 480 (*and n.*), 533, 535 *sq.*, 538
- Arcas, 628
- Archelaus, 259
- Architecture, Egyptian progress in, 101; historical development of, 407-415; in Crete, 432 *sq.*; Mycenae, 457
- Arctinus, 501, 514
- Ardata, 306, 309
- Ares, 510, 516, 635, 638
- Argaeus, 254, 272, 274
- Argo, ship, 475, 478, 507, 544, 560
- Argolis, 437, 454, 457, 460, 479; Dorians in, 532-534, 536-538
- Argonauts, the, 609
- Argos, 457, 467, 476, 479, 492, 520, 525, 631; ('Pelagian'), 476, 481, 482; traditions of early history, 477 *sq.*, 483; wars with Thebes, 477; Dorians at, 533 *sq.*, 537 *sq.*, 544
- Ariadne, 617
- Ariel, 394
- Arik-dén-ilu, 238
- Arimasp, 278, 292
- Arinna (Araina), 82, 258, 259, 269, 270 *sq.*, 272, 350; *see* Aruna
- Ariovistus, 39
- Arisbe, 490
- el-'Arish, 359
- Aristarchus, 516
- Aristodemus, 497, 532 *sq.*
- Aristomachus, 497, 526, 533
- Aristophanes, 22, 602, 606, 624, 630
- Aristotle, 27, 553
- Ariunna, 281, 488 n.
- 'Arka, 304
- Armenia, 3; population—modern, 5, ancient, 13 *sq.*; language, Indo-Eur., 14, 25, 39
- Arnoaldi, 573
- Arnon, 366

- Arnuni, 238
 Arnu(w)andash (Arandas, Arnuasta, etc.), 238, 264, 267, 318
 Arrâbe, 314
 Art: Egypt and the Near East, Ch. xv (historical development, architecture, sculpture, etc., 407-415; small arts, costume, pottery, etc., 415-426; Syria and the East, 426-430); Minoan (Late I), 434 sqq.; technique, 444, 447; Mycenaean, 454 sqq., 463 sq., 466; Thessaly, 468 sq.; 'Caro-Lelegian' pottery, 554 sq.; Western Mediterranean (Ch. xxi)—prehistoric art, mainland, 567 sqq.; Sicily, 570; Iberian peninsula, rock-paintings, 585 sqq.; see also Egypt (s.v.), Hittites, Ikhnaton (401, 411, 413), Minoan culture, Mycenae, Mycenaean war, Philistines (290, 294 n., 329)
 Artā- (= Sanskrit *rita*), 331, 400 sq.
 Artā-khiba, 400
 Artamanya, 331
 Artatama I, 92, 94, 300
 — II, 237, 301
 Artashumara, 300
 Artaxerxes, 3, 400
 Artemis, 604, 616 sq., 622, 634 sq., 638; Brauronia, 623, 634; (Tauric), 634; Triclaria, 620
 Artemisium, 554, 562
 Aruma, 249, 250
 Aruna, 272; see Arianna
 Arunassil, 400; see Varuna
 Arvad, 57, 240, 267 sq., 284, 305; Thutmose III, 75 sq., 328; Ramses II, 141, 148; Assyrians at, 250 sq.
 Arvernī, the, 35
 Aryan influences in Syria, 331; language, in France and British Isles, 596; see Indo-Europeans
 Arzaia, 312
 Arzanene, 250
 Arzanibiu (Arzaniwīu), 250
 Arzawa, 234, 260, 264, 271 sq., 427
 Arzawaia (-wīya), 312, 331
 Arzaya, 312
 Arzukhina, 251 (?) the Artakene of Strabo, *Geog.* XVI, 1, 3)
 Asaniū, 250
 Asaru, 319; see Asher
 Asclepius, 624, 632
 Asha, 400 sq.
 Ashdōd, 289, 291, 380, 560
 Asher, 311, 319, 327, 357, 367
 Asherah, 348; see Ashirat
 Ashir, 348; see below
 Ashirat (Ashrati), 346, 348 sq.
 'Ashtarah, Tell, 311
 Ashtarti, town, 311, 348
 Ashtōreth, 289, 348; see Ashirat
 Ashur, city (Kāla'at Sherkat)¹, 229 n., 230, 232 sqq., 258, 270, 430
 Ashur, god, 241, 249; temple of, 241
 Ashur (= Assyria), 280
 Ashur-bel-nishesh, 233
 Ashur-dan, 244, 246 sq.
 Ashur-nadin-akhi, 234, 329
 Ashur-nadin-apli (-našir apli), 243
 Ashur-našir-pal, 351; III, 430
 Ashur-nirari III, 232, 243 (and n.)
 Ashur-rabi I, 232
 Ashur-rēsh-ishi, 247; I, 248
 Ashur-rim-nishesh(u), 233
 Ashur-shum-lishir, 247
 Ashur-uballit, 234 sqq., 301, 329
 — II, 259 sq., 273
 Asia, interrelations with Africa and Europe, Ch. 1; south-western A. and Egypt, 1, Chs. III-VIII; central, migrations, 6; Hyksos, 40
 Asia Minor, peoples of, Ch. 1; unique significance of, 1; general physical conditions, 2-6; climate, 3 sq.; minerals, 4 sq.; peoples, physical traits of, 5; ethnic suffixes, 16 sq., 282; place-names (see Balkans); Earth-goddess, 18 sq.; Romans, 19; Celts, 35; growth of relations with Egypt, 228 (see Hittites, Ch. XI); Assy, 281; intercourse with Crete, 438; Mycenae, 459 sq.; effect of Dorian migration, 518 sq.; Hellenic settlement in, Ch. xx (main traditions, 542-548; resistance of Ionia and its cause, 548-553; earlier 'Caro-Lelegian' civilization, 553-558; process of settlement, 558-562)
 Asine, 457 sq., 533, 540 sq.
 Askalon, 124, 148, 165, 169, 288 sq., 291, 294, 315, 319 sq., 341 (see 350), 379 sq., 547
 Aspendus, 559
 Assarlik, 294, 515, 542, 554
 Asshur; see Ashur
 Assus, 488
 Assyria (see Ashur), 6, 88; commerce with Egypt, 57; rise of, 58; A. and Mitanni, 67, 230, 237; Thutmose III, 73, 231 sq., 329; alliance with Amenhotep III, 96; Shalmaneser I on Euphrates, 149 (see Ch. x); international relations, 229, 301 sq., 320, 377; friendship with Egypt, 231 sq.; conquest of Kassites, 237; reign

¹ Some authorities (e.g. Jastrow) write Ashur for city, god and land; others (e.g. Meyer) prefer Assur, Aššur or Ashshur; and yet others (e.g. Hall, King) distinguish the god (Ashur) from the city (Assur); see *É.Bi.* col. 349, n. 1. The last though technically preferable obscures the identity of the names.

- of Shalmaneser I, 240 *sq.*, 266 *sq.*; Tukulti-Ninurta at Babylon, 242; A. attacked by Nebuchadnezzar I, 247 *sq.*; reign of Tiglath-pileser I, 248-251; language, 254, 333 *sq.*, 430; records of Hittite expansion westward, 377 *sq.*; art, 428 *sq.*; ethnology, 429 *sq.*
- Astarte, 154, 159, 266, 289, 345, 347 *sqq.*, 403
- Astronomy, in Egypt, 218
- Aswān, 410
- Asy, 279 *sqq.*, 547
- Atalanta, 604, 617
- Atargatis, 288 *sq.*
- 'Atārōth, 394
- Atestine, 572
- Athamas, 618
- Athena, 485, 510, 515, 603 *sq.*, 610, 616 *sq.*, 625, 635, 638, 641; Apaturia, 635; Boulaia, 635; Phratia, 635; Polias, 635; Tritogenia, 635
- Athenaeus, 10 *n.*, 27, 557
- Athenians—(?) Pelasgians, 8; = 'Iavones,' 514
- Athens, 602, 610; Minos, 476; Homeric Catalogue, 481; study of Homer (Pisistratus), 502 *sq.*; iron at, 524; Ionians, 532; colonists of Asia Minor from, 543 *sq.*; *Anthesteria*, 629; the School of Hellas, 636
- Athribis, 186
- Atika, 178
- Aton, sole god, 111, 119 *sq.*, 125, 206; = Re, 111; new symbol of, 111 *sq.*, 399; Karnak temple, 112; conflict with Amon, 112 *sq.*; Aton-cities, 114 *sq.*, 399; Aton-hymns, 117 *sqq.*, 206; traditional beliefs about, 126; *see* Ikhnaton
- Atreus, 460, 477, 482, 497, 609
- Treasury of, 457, 459
- Atridae, the, kingdoms of, 479, 482
- Attic dialect, 509
- Attica, Pelasgians in, 8, 476; Ionians, 18, 532, 543; no Aeolians nor Dorians, 30, 518, 534 *n.*; Mycenae, 459; refugees of Pylus in, 541; Artemis Brauronia, 623
- Attis, 615
- 'Atum, House of,' 152
- Augmia, 250
- Aulia, 491
- Aurignacian remains, 463, 579 *sq.*
- Avebury, 594
- Avesta, the, 25
- 'Avvim, the, 286
- Axius river, 476, 492, 530 *n.*
- Axylon plains, 259
- Ayāb, 316 (for the evidence of the new Amarna tablet, Louvre 7094, *see* Dhorme, *Rev. Bib.* 1924, p. 9)
- Ayan desert, 177
- Aylesford, 593
- Azerbaijan, 17
- Azilian culture, 564; in Spain and S. France, 586; in France, 591
- Aziru (Azira), 382; and Ikhnaton, 107, 123 *sq.*, 302; name Semitic, 299, 302; in Amarna Letters, 305-310, 317 *sq.*, 323 *sq.*, 329, 340 *sq.*
- Azov, Greek colonies, 32
- Azu, 250
- bā'dl*, 56, 345, 348 (1, pp. 207 *sqq.*), 399, 402
- Baal, god, 56, 154, 159, 349, 350 *sq.*, 387, 401, 403; of Gaza, 289
- bā'dlath*, 56, 305, 340, 345, 347
- Baal-berith, 340, 387
- Baal-hānān, 393
- Baal-pē'ōr, 366
- Baal-pērāzīm, battle, 291, 293
- Baal-zēbūb, 289
- Baal-zēphōn, 348
- Babylon, Cyrus' expedition to, 3; and Hittites, 6, 149, 265, 267; Euphrates, 56 *sq.*; Mitanni, 58; Thutmose III, 73, 77; alliance with Egyptian empire, 94 *sq.*, 106, 110, 121 *sq.*, 297; commerce with Egypt, 154, 380; Hittite raid, 230; Assyrians at, 242; overthrow of Kassites at, 244; 'Pashe' dynasty, 244; ruled by *shakin*, 245; Tiglath-pileser, 251; intercourse with Syria, 330, 378; Ishtar-gate at, 430
- Babylonia, 227, 280; international relations, 229, 311, 320 (*see* Babylon); Kassite rule in, 244 *sqq.*; private life in, 246; language, 253 *sq.*, 332 *sqq.*; language used among Semites, etc., 377; histories, 256; art, 427-430
- Bacchylides, 27, 557
- Bahria ware, 578
- Balaam (Bil'am), 366, 393
- Balearic Isles, 581-584, 599
- Balkans, the, and Asia Minor, 17, 487; Wiros, 28; Slavs, 32
- Banazana, 332
- Bantishinna, 318 *sqq.*, 332, 343
- Bārāk, 375, 386 *sq.*
- Bargā, 238, 240
- Barletta, 567
- Barrows, long, 594; round, 595
- Barzillai, 373
- Bāshān, 366 *sq.*
- basileus* (Homeric), 482
- Basque language, 23
- Bastarnae, the, 38
- Bath-shēba', 374
- 'Beaker' pottery, in Spain, 589; Balearic Is., 590; Sardinia, 590; Italy, 590; in France and Britain, 596
- Bedouins, 82, 135, 177, 219, 234, 319, 326; *see also* Sutu
- Bē'erōth, 373 *sq.*, 389
- Bē'er-shēba', 359, 361, 392, 394

- Beirût, 141, 306 *sq.*, 326, 337, 344
 Beisân, 376
 Bek, 115, 121, 412
Bekâ (*Bukâ*), 55 *n.*, 142
 Beketaton, 115
 Beki, 159
 Bel, 'the older,' 250
 Bela', 393
 Belgae, the, 593
 Belgium, 599
 Belikh, 263
 Bellerophon, 9, 508
bêl-pakhâtî, 245
 Benacci periods (*see* Villanovan), 573
 Ben-ana, 332, 335
 Bendis, 634
 Beni-berak, 314
 Beni-hasan, 65
 Benjâmin, 366, 368, 370, 374, 389, 390 *sq.*
 Ben-ônî, 390
 Berber race, 580; origins, 166
 Berlin, 21
 Bermius, 528, 530
 Bes, god, 345, 350, 419, 424
 Beth-car, 291
 Beth-êl, 352 *sq.*, 360, 370 *sq.*, 373, 389 *sq.*, 399
 Beth-hôrôn, 396
 Bethlêhêm, 354, 371 *sq.*, 390, 392 *sq.*
 Beth-ninurta, 305, 315
 Beth-rêhûb, 369
 Beth-sêpher, 326
 Beth-shê'ân, 289, 291, 319, 372, 376, 387, 391; Amarna Letters, 312, 317, 326
 Beth-shêmêsh, 291, 294
 Bêzal'el, 364
 Biashshi-ilish, 301 *sq.*
 Bible, Wulfila's translation of the, 39; origin of the word, 333
 Biblical references; *see* Ch. xiv *passim*, and *separate Index*, p. 749; O.T. and Philistines, 275, 332; O.T., value as historical source, 318, 405 *sq.*; parallels with Amarna Letters, 338 *sq.*, 342 *sq.*; O.T. narrative, 352-358; account of Exodus and Conquest, 358-369; account of rise of the monarchy, 369-376; parallel traditions of Israel's entry into Palestine, 360; composite O.T. records, 375; attitude of O.T. to history, 383 *sq.*; bearing of archaeology on O.T., 384
biblos, 333
 Bighadich, 555
 Bikhishi, 316 (? *read* Bikhilim, *i.e.* Fahil, Pella)
 Bilhah, 367, 390
 Bilhân, 367
 Bingemma hills, 578
 Birejik, 255
 Biridashwa, 331
 Biridiya, 331
 Biruaza (Biriamazu?), 309
 Bisceglie tomb, 567
 Bishri, 250
 Bismantova, 571, 572
 Bithynians, 487
 Bithynoi, 17
 'Bitter Lakes,' 152
 Bituriges, 35
 Black Sea, metal-working areas, 3; climate of southern coast, 3; Ionian colonies, 18, 20
 Bochim, 360
 Boebe, 481
 Boeotia, and Leleges, 27; Dorians, 30, 518, 520; Minoan culture, 437; and Mycenae, 454 *sq.*, 457, 459 *sq.*, 467; Thessaly, 468, 631; Homeric Catalogue, 480, 482; dialect, 509, 519; Poseidon, 631; Athena, 635
 Boeotians, 474; in Asia Minor, 545
 Boghaz Keui, 1, 13, 33, 130 *n.*, 141 *n.*, 142, 147 *n.*, 150, 228, 239, 254, 258, 296, 335 (*and n.*); source for Hittite history, 253, 257, 259, 260 *n.*, 264-267, 273, 319 *sq.*, 331, 400, 429; = Hattushash, 256, 266; codified law, 269; art, 269 *sq.*; 'King's Gate' relief, 270 *sq.*; Kanesian texts, 428 *n.*
 Bôhan, 389
 Bohemian Forest, 21; Wiros, 28 *sq.*; Germans, 37
 Boii, the, 26; in Italy, 35
 Bologna, 571
 'Book of the Dead,' 51 *sq.*, 197, 222; relation of ethics to *hike*, 201 *sq.*, 210; illumination of papyrus, 414
 Boreas, 610
 Bosphorus, formation of, 20
 Botrys, 303 *sq.*
 'Boxer Vase,' 290
 Branchidae, 552
 Brasidas, 628
 Breasted, J., Egyptian chronology, 702
 Brescia, 35, 566, 568
 Breton language, 34
 Brigantium (Bregenz), 35
 Briges, Brigoi, 487
 Briseis, 498
 Britain, in Ice Age, 21; Celts, 34
 British Isles, 582; late Celtic culture, 593; long 'barrows,' 594; round 'barrows,' 595; early trade with, 598 (*and n.*)
 Britomartis, 289, 617, 634
 Brittany, Celts in, 34; megaliths, 592
 Bronze, superseded by iron (weapons), 292; Syrian weapons, 329
 Bronze Age: 'Wiros,' 29; remains (Hattic?), 257; the Hatti, 259; Dorian invasion of Greece, 431; end of Bronze Age, 446 *sq.*; tholos tombs (Mycenae), 456; Homer, Ch. xviii, *see also* 466; transition to Iron

- Age, 467, 470, 472, 521 *sq.*; Thessaly, 468 *sq.*; Achaeans, 484; Italy—tombs, 567, 'terremare' folk, 569; N. Africa, 580; Sardinia, 582; France, 592; England, 595
- Bronze-casting in Egypt, 57
- Bryges, 13, 284
- Brythonic, a Celtic dialect, 596
- Bubastis, 137
- bûle*, Achaean, 483
- Bulgaria, 599
- Bull, symbol of divinity, 351, 622 *sq.*
- Bûphonia*, the, 602, 623
- Bur-anati, 386
- Burials, Philistine, 293; palaeolithic, 563, 565 *sq.*; Bronze Age, 570, 584, 592; Iron Age, 574
- Burkun, 314
- Burmeghez cave, 578
- Burna-buriash (Burra-buriash) I, 121, 125, 230, 232
- II, 232 *sq.*, 234 *sq.*, 236, 297, 301; in Amarna Letters, 309, 313, 343
- III, 238
- Burusha, 246
- Burushkhanda, 6
- Busbecq's discovery of Gothic dialect, 39
- Buşrun, 311
- Butmir, 555
- Byblus, 89, 107 *sq.*, 192 *sq.*, 224, 250, 305, 309, 345, 378, 382, 399; the *bd'dlath* of, 56, 305, 340; in Amarna Letters, 326, 329; *biblos*, 333; *see also* Rib-Addi
- Byzantine influence in Palestine, 376
- Byzantium, 31
- C. In proper names *c* has generally been used here to represent the Greek κ . In Hebrew names it represents *kaph* (כ), and is retained in familiar spellings (*e.g.* Cush, contrast Kassite). *Ch* (which is used in French for *sh*) is soft in Persian (*ch* in *church*), but hard in Semitic names (*e.g.* Cherethites). In the O.T. it represents both *k* (כ) and *h* (ח).
- Cabeço de Arruda, 586
- Cadiz, 379
- Cadmeians (traditional), 552, 557
- Cadmus of Thebes, 27
- Caeneus, 527 *sq.*
- Caesarea Mazaca, 5, 254; *see* Kanes
- Calculus river, 4, 488
- Cairo, Museum, 53, 127; Saladin, 81
- Calah, 430
- Calauria, 631
- Calchas, 498, 626
- Caleb, 364, 367, 373, 375, 385
- Calendar, Egyptian regulation of, 47 (*see* I, p. 168)
- callais*, in Iberian peninsula, 588; in Britany, 592
- Callisto, 604, 617 *sq.*, 634
- Calydnae, 482
- Calydon, 480
- Calymnus, 294
- Cambyzes, a legend of, 91
- Camiris, tribe, 529 *n.*
- Camirus, 482, 528 *sq.*, 552
- Camp de Chassey, 591
- Campania, 36 *sq.*, 572
- Campignian (palaeolithic) culture, 591
- Canaan, 135, 169; application of name, 295 *n.*, 376 *n.*, 379 *n.*; Philistine civilization, 289-295; *see* Palestine
- Canaanites, 56, 232, 376; in O.T., 357, 365, 387, 391, 396; application of name, 376 *n.*; war-chariots of, 423; art of, 426 *sq.*
- Canopus, Ptolemaic decree, 276
- Cap Corse, 584
- Caphtôr, 275, 279 (? = Crete), 286-289; etymology, 290
- Cappadocia, 6, 15, 241, 250, 284, 320, 377; language, 252; Hittite culture, 252 *sq.*; monuments, 254; earliest period of H. culture, 256-259; 'Hattic' dynasty, 260-269, 547; Hittite art, 270 *sq.*
- Capsian culture, 579 *sq.*; in Spain, 585 *sq.*
- Caranus, 528
- Caravans, 297 *sq.*, 302, 311-314, 316, 343
- Carchemish, 7, 174, 233, 240, 250, 255, 267, 302, 320, 386; Thutmose III, 77; Ramses II, 141, 262; Assyrians at, 239, 241, 266; Hittites at, 261, 264, 266, 269 *sq.*, 271; art, 270, 428 *sqq.*
- Caria (=Phoenice), 27
- Carians, 9, 544; mercenaries, 10, 379; language, 16; Leleges, 27, 552; Phaestus disk, 278, 287; 'Peoples of the Sea,' 278, 283 *sq.*; Philistines, 288 *sqq.*; Minos, 475; 'Caro-Lelegian' civilization, 553-558; pottery, 554 *sq.*; writing, 556; *see also* Assarlik, Beth-car
- Carmel, 55 *sq.*, 68, 192, 379
- Carnac, megaliths, 592
- Carnarvon, Lord, 129 *n.*, 415, 418
- Carpathians, 20; and 'Wiros,' 28 *sq.*
- Carpathus, 482
- Carpi, the, 26
- Carrowmore (Ireland), 594
- Carter, Howard, 129 *n.*, 415
- Carthage, 328, 581
- Carystus, 633
- Casûkhîm, 288
- Caspian Gates, 17
- Caspian Sea, 20; Scythians, 32; Hatti (?), 259
- Cassandra, 539, 633
- Cassiterides, the, 598
- Castellazzo, 569

- Castelluccio, 567
 Castenedolo, 563
 Casus, 482
 Catalonia, 589
 Cataonia, 15, 250, 260
 Caucasus, 17, 20, 259, 599; cherry-bark, 424
 Caucuses, the, 14
 Caunus, 10, 553
 Cave-dwellings and tombs, in Iberian peninsula, 589
 Cayster river, 4
 Celaenae, 3, 554
 Celenderis, 559
 Celtiberi, the, 35
 Celtic languages, 25; dialect-groups, 33 *sq.*, 596; culture, 593
 Celto-ligures, the, 35
 Celto-scythae, 35
 Celts, 23, 26; dispersal of, 33; two types in Gaul (?), 33 *sq.*; in Britain, 34; in Spain, 35; and Germans, 37
 Cenchreae, 483
 Cenomani, the, 35
 Cephallenia, 480, 483, 522
 Cephalus (Plato, *Rep.*), 642
 Certosa, 573
 Cevennes, the, 20
 Châlain, lake, 591
 Chalcis, 451, 454 *sq.*; (Aetolian), 480
 Chalybes, 5, 524
 Changli, 554
Chansons de Geste, 513
 Chariot, introduced into Egypt, 43, 167, 227, 423; Mycenae, 461 *sq.*; Achaean, 484
 Charlemagne, 513
 Chêdôrlâ'ômer, 346, 385
 Chémôsh, 394, 404
 Chêphirah, 373
 Chêrêthites, 285, 288, 291, 380, 392; *see* Philistines
 Chinnêreth, 325, 353
 Chios, 501, 507, 620; settlers in, 544 *sq.*, 552, 558; 'Caro-Lelegians,' 553; Chian settlers in Thrace, 561
chitôn, 515
 Chronicles, Books of, 363
 Chryse, 488
 Chryseis, 498
 Chryses, 498 *sq.*
 Cicones, the, 488
 Ciempozuelos, 589
 Cilices (in Troad), 488
 Cilicia, 3, 15, 273 *sq.*, 280, 546; Hittite culture, 252 *sq.*; Kedi, plain of, 267; Kisauwadna (?), 299; art, 427, 430 *n.*; Hellenic settlers, 559 *sq.*
 Cilicians, 8, 11, 141; Keftians and, 278 *sq.*, 286
 Cilla, 488, 496
 Cimbri, the, 38
 Cimmerian Bosphorus, 561
 Cimmerians, the, 16 *sq.*, 549
 Circe, 500
 Cithaeron, 481
 Clairvaux, lake, 591
 Clarium, 552
 Clazomenae, 552; colony, 561
 Cleonae, 463, 479
 'Cleopatra's Needle,' 79, 87
 Clymenus, 618
 Clytaemnestra, 477
 Cnidians, 529 *n.*
 Cnidus, 530, 552
 Cnossus, 27 *sq.*, 286 *sq.*, 618, Ch. xvi, i-iv *passim*; intercourse with Egypt, 277, 279; theatre, 290; Hall of Double Axes, 432; Palace, 433 *sq.*, 440; Little Palace, 440; fall of C., 442 *sq.*; shaft-graves, 445; connection with Mycenae, 451 *sq.*, 453, 456, 463, 465-468, 472; Achaeans, 474, 482, 486, 537
 Codridae, the, 549
 Codrus, 543
 Coele-syria, 55 *n.*
 Coenus, 528
 Coffin Texts, 197 *sq.*, 222
 Cogamus river, 11
 Cogul rock-painting, 586
 Coinage, Lydian, 11
 Colonnades, external, in Egypt, 62, 73 *sq.*
 Colophon, 541, 545, 549 *sq.*, 552, 559; colony at, 561
 Comana, 250, 272
 Commagene, 238 *sq.*, 242, 249
 Constantine (province), 579
 Constantinople, 25, 79, 257
 Continental interrelations of Europe, Asia and Africa, Ch. 1 *sq.*
 Copais, 459, 481
 Coppa Navigata, 530, 570
 Copper, 5 *n.*; mines of Sinai, 65, 178; of Cyprus, 96, 333; of Lebanon, 310 *sq.*; Syrian, 329; Cretan, 442; in prehistoric Italy, 566; Sicily and Sardinia, 566, 583; in Spain, 587 *sq.*; in France, 592
 Coptos, Min of, 50; gold-mines, 85; trade, 178
 Corcyra, 459, 475, 538 *n.*
 Corinna, 27, 557
 Corinth, origin of name, 27, 467; Aeolians, 30, 535; C. and Mycenae, 454, 457, 459 *sq.*; Thessaly, 468; Agamemnon, 478 *sq.*; Dorians, 520, 529 *sq.*, 534, 538 (*and n.*)
 Corneto tombs, 573
 Cornish language, 34; tin mines, 598
 Coronea, 480
 Coronus, 527 *sq.*
 Corradino, 577
 Corsica, 581-584, 599
 Cos, 482, 529, 552

- Costig (Majorca), 584
 Cremation of dead, 293 *sq.*, 447, 514 *sq.*, 522 *n.*, 567 (*and n.*), 569 *sq.*, 572, 574, 592
 Cremona, 568
 Cresphontes, 497, 532 *sq.*
 Crete, Ch. XVI (Late Minoan I, 431-439; Late Minoan II, 439-441; Fall of Crete: Late Minoan III, 441-448); Pelasgians in, 8 *sq.*; Dorians, 18, 518; Minoan tradition, 27 *sq.*; language, 28; culture, in Syria, 57 *sq.*; Egyptian commerce and religion, 80, 97, 277 *n.*, 279 *sq.*; Philistines, 173, 275, 287, 427; Crete = (?) Caphtor, Keftiu, 275, 279 *sq.*, 286 *sqq.*; Cretan coiffure, 278 *sq.*; Oaxians, 283 *n.*; 'Kérēthi,' 285 (*see* Cherethites); Zeus, 285; Philistine cultural parallels, 290; intercourse with Aegean, 437 *sq.*; navy, 441; bases of Cretan power, 442; Mycenae, 459, 467 (*see* Cnossus); Achaeans, 473, 475, 481 *sq.*; Crete and Troy, 490; Dorians, *see* Ch. XIX; iron, 524 *sq.*, 537; pre-Hellenic Cretans in Asia Minor, 552 *sq.*, 556
 Crimea, 17, 599; Greek colonies, 32, 560; a Gothic dialect in, 39
 Crisa, 480
 Croesus, 16
 Cro-Magnon race, 580, 591, 596
 Cronos, 606 *sq.*, 617, 621, 629
 Crusaders' routes, 3
 Cueto de Mina, 585
 Cueva de Castillo, palaeolithic implements, 585; *calvaria*, 586
 Cuneiform writing, 57; general adoption of, 228 *sq.*; adopted by Kassites, 245; at Boghaz Keui, 253, 264, 266, 296; Assyro-Babylonian records, 257, 332; Mitannian, 259; Hittite art and, 270 *sq.*
 Curētes, the, 480, 615
curia, 483
 Cush; *see* Kush
 Cūshan-rishāthāim, 385
 Cybele, 18 *sq.*, 613
 Cyclades, the, 437, 448-450, 482, 554 *sqq.*, 633
 Cycnus, 620
 Cydonians, the, 28
 Cylinder seals, in Syria, 330
 Cyllene, 533, 637
 Cyme (Asia Minor), 496, 509, 544, 549, 553, 558 *sq.*
 Cynesians, the, 35
 Cynuria, 535, 536
Cypria, the (epic poem), 500 *sq.*
 Cyprus, Ionians in, 18; Arcadians, 29, 520, 536 *sq.*, 546; intercourse with Egypt, 78, 80, 94, 97, 154, 275, 333; Cyprus = (?) Alasa, 194; art, 270, 427; Cyprus = (?) 'Caphtor,' Keftiu, 275; = (?) Asy, 280 *sq.* (*see* Philistines); Minoans, 286; pottery in Palestine, 294, at Troy, 472; copper, 333, 583; influence of, in Palestine, 376; 'Canaanite' pottery in, 427; intercourse with Crete, 438; Mycenae, 460, 464; Teucrians, 491; Greek (Attic) dialect in, 509; syllabic script, 546; human sacrifice, 620
 Cyrene, 537
 Cyril (apostle of the Slavs), 25
 Cyrus, the elder, and Lydia, 6
 — the younger, expedition of, 3
 Cythera, 483, 486, 535, 540, 638
 Cyzicus, 488 *n.*, 552
- D. The emphatic *d* is often used to represent the Arabic *dād* (ض); *dh* (rarely in use for the soft Hebrew ט) represents the Arabic *dhal* (ذ). The Egyptian *d* is in various systems represented by *dz*, *z*, or *dj*.
- Daanau, 276, 283; *see* Danai
 Dacians, the, 38
 Dagan, 377
 Dāgōn, 289, 350
 Damascus, 296, 369; Thutmose III, 72; Amenhotep III, 107; Hittites, 263, 265; D. = Ube, 310 *sq.*, 326
 Dān, city, 338, 369, 371; tribe, 354, 367, 370, 388, 396; its migration, 314 (*and n.*), 388, 396
 Danai, the, 8, 173, 281, 476; *see* Daanau, Danuna, Denyen
 Danite movement; *see* Dan
 Danube, 28, 33, 38, 471, 474
 Danuna, the, 8, 281, 283 (*and n.*), 322; *see* Danai
 Daphnae, 562
 Daphnūs, 480
 Dardanelles, the, and Indo-Europeans, 12; formation of, 20
 Dardani, the, 8, 275 (Dardeni), 474, 487 *sq.*, 493, 495; *see below*
 Dardania, origin of name, 17; people, 141, 165, 275, 281 *sq.*, 488; *see* Dardani
 Dardenui (-ni), the, 281 *sq.*, 488; *see* Dardani
 Daria, 250
 Dariel, pass of, 20
 Darius, 13
 Dasha, Dashartt, 331
 Daunians (Daanau), 276
 David, Ch. XIV (392-397); *see also* 291 *sq.*, 310, 317, 323, 334; in O.T., 354, 371, 406 *n.*; his reign, 372 *sqq.*, 384, 388 *sq.*; the name, 394, 397, 402
 Dead Sea, 55 *sq.*, 353, 365 *sq.*
 Dēbir, 336, 353
 Debōrah, 375, 386 *sq.*; Song of, 370, 386 390, 398

- Decelea, 534 *n.*
 Deianeira, 531
 Deiphobus, 487
 Deiras (Argos), 525
 Delos, Carian graves, 9, 27, 556; Apollo, 632
 Delphi, Celts at, 35; oracle of Apollo at, 486, 611, 624, 629, 632 *sq.*; amphictyony, 532, 633; Gē, 611
 Delta of the Nile, Ionian colonies, 18; Libyans, 53; Thutmose III, 81; commerce, 88, 97; imperial centre, 151 *sq.*; Libyan and allied invasions, 166-169, 173 *sqq.*, 288, 295, 320 *sq.*, 537; D. lost to Egypt, 191 *sq.*, 378; 'Ha-nebu,' 276 *sq.*; Cretan commerce, 277 *n.*
 Demeter, 611, 616, 631, 636 *sq.*; Anesidora, 636; Chloe, 623; Karpophoros, 636; Thesmophoros, 636
 Denyen (? Danai), 173 *sq.*, 268
 Deper (? Tabor), 148, 319
 Dēr, 242, 245, 247
 Derceto, 288 *sq.*
 Dēr el-Bahri, Hatshepsut's temple, 61 *sqq.*, 65 *sq.*, 409, 412
 Derr, 147
 Deucalion, 26, 475, 482, 526, 530
 Dia, 528
 Diarbekr, 239
 Dictaeon Cave, 444
 Dictynna, 289, 617, 634
 Dido, 323, 394
Dikē, 400
 Dilmun, 242
 Dimeni, 470
 Dīnāh, 359, 370
 Dinair, 554
 Dinaric Alps, 20
 Diocletian, 26
 Diodorus, 23, 158, 527 *sq.*, 581 *n.*
 Diomede, 477, 479, 492, 499
 Dione, 616 *sq.*
 Dionysus, 31, 604, 606, 612, 615 *sq.*, 619, 622 *sqq.*, 638, 641; Aigobolos, 620; Omados, 620; Omestes, 621; Zagreus, 606
 Dipylon culture, 534 *n.*
 Dium, 528
 Dōd, 395
 Dōdāvah, 394
 Dodekaschoinos, the, 182, 184
 Dōdō, 323, 393 *sq.*
 Dodona, 31, 476, 481, 486, 530 *sq.*, 612, 624, 626, 629, 633
 Dog river, stela of Ramses II, 141, 344
 Dolon, 499, 504
 Dolopians, 481
 Dongola province, 54, 90
 Dōr, 192, 285, 295, 343, 378, 380; in O.T., 353, 387
 Dorians, in Crete, 18, 28, 30, 514; *see* Ch.
- XIX (traditions, linguistic evidence, 518-520; transitional period, 520-525; Dorian tribes, 525-531; conquest by, 531-538; Sparta, 538-541; Dorians in Greece, 30; invasion of Greece and the Aegean, 431, 447, 466 *sq.*, 496, 545; Rhodes, 482 *n.*; art and culture (Geometric), 521 *sqq.*; Herodotus, 526 *sq.*; theory of Illyrian origin, 531
 Doric dialect, 467, 509, 519
 Doris, 520, 526 *n.*, 527, 532
 Dorus, 526 *sqq.*
 Dorylaeum, 3
 Dotian Plain, 524, 529 *n.*
 Dryopians, 474
 Dryopis, 526 (*and n.*)
 Dudkhali(ya)(sh) (*cf.* Tid'al), 239, 260, 267, 385
 Dudu, 323, 340, 357, 384
 Dudu-Amen, 330
 Dulichium, 480
 Dur-apil-sin, 247
 Dur-dungi, 236
 Duri-ulmash, 245
 Dur-kurigalzu, 251
 Dushratta; *see* Tushratta
 Dutch language, 39
 Dwauf, 'Teachings of, 222
 'Dying Gladiator,' 33
 Dymanes, the, 525, 527, 529 *n.*
 Dymas, 527
 'Ēbāl, 326, 370, 391
 Ebenezer, battles of, 291
 Echemus, 526, 527 *n.*, 532
 Echelos, 623
 Echinades, the, 480
 Edfu, 138
 Ēdōm, 296, 320, 364, 366, 368 *sq.*, 375; = Esau, 352, 360, 366, 389, 404; Herod, an Edomite, 367; connection with Israel, 382, 385, 390, 391 *sqq.*, 406 *n.*
 Edrē'i, 311 *sq.*
 Eglōn, 353, 370
 Egypt, Chs. III-VIII, xv; and Hittites, 7; Middle Kingdom, 40; New Kingdom, *see below*; commerce with Babylon, 57; cosmography, 58; mistress of the East, 88-98; = 'the Two Lands,' 118; the Empire, Chs. III-VI (*see below*); Harmhab's reconstruction, 131-135; age of Ramses II, Ch. VII; fall of empire, Ch. VIII; E. still leader of civilization, 195
 — Empire: foundation and expansion, Ch. III; internal conditions and administration, 40-53; expansion (to death of Hatshepsut), 53-66; army, 42; the Pharaoh's function, 43 *sq.*; officials, 44 *sq.*; treasury ('White House'), 44; land tenure, 44 *sq.*; the Pharaoh's income, 45 *sq.*; justice, 46 *sq.*; southern vizier's

- functions, 45 *sqq.*; bribery, 47; public code of law, 47; calendar, 47 (*see* vol. I, p. 168); control of temples, 47; 'new' nobility, 48 *sq.*; power of army and priesthood, 49; state religion, 50-53; Thutmose I at Euphrates, 59; his temple-restorations, 59 *sq.*; succession of Hatshepsut, 60 *sqq.*; her navy, 62 *sq.*; temple-restorations, 65 *sq.*, 409 *sq.*; Thutmose III and Hatshepsut, 66
- Egypt, Empire: reign of Thutmose III, Ch. IV; consolidation, 67-78; empire of Thutmose III, 78-87; revolt of Syria, 67; its reduction, 75 *sq.*, 262, 300, 420; Euphrates valley, 77 *sq.*; administration, 81; review of Th.'s reign, 86 *sq.*
- Empire: zenith of Egyptian power, and reign of Amenhotep III, Ch. V; Egypt mistress of the East, 88-98; Amenhotep III, 88-91; Thutmose IV, 91 *sqq.*; civilization and the new age under Amenhotep III, 98-108; increase of wealth and luxury, 98 *sq.*; architecture, 99-103, 410; sculpture, 103 *sq.*
- Ikhnaton, the religious revolutionary, Ch. VI; his religious movement, 109-121; foreign situation, and fall of I., 121-130; reaction of imperial power on theology (universal Aton), 110 *sqq.*, 119, 196 *sq.*, 342, 345; *see* Ikhnaton; foundation of Akhetaton (Amarna), 114 *sq.*; cemetery at Akh., 116 *sq.*; Aton-hymns, 117 *sqq.*, 341; fall of Ikhnaton, 121-127; Amon restored by Tutenkhaton (= Tutenkhamon), 128 *sq.*; period of anarchy, 130, *see* Ch. IX *below*
- age of Ramses II, Ch. VII; predecessors (Harmhab and Seti I), 131-139, 318; wars and foreign relations, 139-151; civilization of the age, 151-163 (Delta, an imperial centre, 151 *sq.*; buildings, 151 *sqq.*, 155 *sq.*; commerce, 153 *sqq.*; sacerdotal conception of empire, 157 *sq.*, 380; economic consequences, 157; religion of the poor, 159; animal-worship, 159; personal religion, 159 *sq.*; prayers, 160, 208; morals, 161)
- Empire, fall of, Ch. VIII (Merneptah and Ramses III—the empire on the defensive, 164-177; internal decay, 177-188; the last of the Ramessids and collapse of empire, 188-195); Merneptah's reign, 165-170; Libyans repulsed, 167 *sqq.*, 320, 475; Ramses III's defensive campaigns, 172-177, 283; commerce, 178; economic consequences of priestly power, 180-185, 378; collapse of empire, 321
- life and thought of the period, Ch. IX; religion—Ikhnaton's reform, 196-209; law, 210-215; the sciences, 215-221; literature, 221-226 (folk-tales and poems, 156; stories, 222 *sq.*; letters, 224 *sq.*; love-songs, 222, 225 *sq.*); *see also* Aton-hymns
- Egypt: development of international (diplomatic) relations, 228 *sq.*; hostility to Hittites, 231; revolts against Ikhnaton, 236 *sq.*; Ramessid decline, 248, 378; Philistines, 288; lack of iron, 292; historical value of Amarna Letters, 321-330, and Ch. XIII *passim*; sea-power, 302; use of Babylonian language, 333 *sq.*; the Sun-god, in Amarna Letters, 340 *sqq.*; conception of kingship, 342 *sq.*, 345 *sq.*; intercourse with Crete, 438, 447; Mycenae, 459; Achaeans, 475; Britain (?), 597
- art, Ch. XV (historical development, architecture, sculpture, etc., 407-415; small art, costume, pottery, etc., 415-426; Syria and the East, 426-430); cemeteries, 52; glass, 57; restoration of temples, 59, 61 *sq.*, 63; 'Valley of Kings' (*q.v.*), 64 *sqq.*; architecture, 99-103; sculpture, 103 *sq.*; other arts and crafts, 104 *sq.*; effect of Aton-worship, 121, 138, 207; Kadesh-relief, 156 *sq.*; decadence, 179 *sq.*; Syrian parallels, 329; length of period, 407 *sq.*; analogy of Chinese development, 408; Hyksos influence, 408 *sq.*; temple-restoration, 409 *sqq.*; Ikhnaton, 411, 413; Saïte revival, 411, 412; sculpture—round, 411 *sq.*, relief, 412 *sq.*; portraiture, 411 *sq.*; characterization and humour, 413; painting, 414 *sq.*; jewellery, scarabs, etc., 415 *sq.*; polychrome glass, 417 *sq.*; ivory, 418 *sq.*; exotic influences, 420; costume, 420 *sqq.*; woven fabrics, 422 *sq.*; chariots, 423 *sq.*; furniture, 424; pottery and faience, 424 *sqq.*; Canaanite pottery in Egypt, 427
- Ēhūd, 370
- Ekereth, 141
- Ekrōn, 289, 291, 332, 372, 380
- Ekwesh; *see* Akaiwasha
- Ēl = 'god,' 348, 389, 397, 399
- Elam, 229, 236, 242 *sqq.*, 247 *sq.*
- Eldad and Medad, 363
- Electrum, in Egypt, 59, 63, 65, 70
- Elephantine, 91, 182, 335
- Eleusis, 28, 481, 632
- Eleutherus river, 57, 75 *sq.*, 83, 379
- Elhānān, 372, 393
- 'Elī, 360 *n.*, 371, 395
- Eliākīm, 349
- Eljāh, 365, 404
- Elis, and Dorians, 30, 518, 520, 531, 541; Epeans, 480; Molpis, 620; Dionysus, 622
- Elishah (= Alashiya, ? Cyprus), 281, 546
- Ellez, 580
- Elōhīm, 350, 400 *n.*
- Elukhat, 241
- Elyōn, 397
- Elysian Plain, 627

- Embalmers, 52
 Emesa, 319; *see* Homs
 Enderuta (Intaruda), 315
 Endymion, 609
 Enete, 14; Eneti, the, 14, 17; *see* Veneti
 England, plain of, 21
 English language, 39
 Enienes, the, 481
 Enishasi, 327
 Enkomi, 278 *sq.*, 292, 416, 430 *n.*
 Enlil (god), temple, 234
 Enlil-bani, 244
 Enlil-kudur-usur, 243
 Enlil-nadin-akhe, 244
 Enlil-nadin-apli, 248
 Enlil-nadin-shum, 242, 245
 Enlil-nasir, 232
 Enlil-nirari, 236, 237 *sq.*, 244
 Eoliths, 21
 Epeans, the, 480
 Ephesus, 4, 529, 543, 549, 552, 554, 558;
 Ionians at, 18, 545, 550, 562; Poseidon,
 623; (?) goddess, 634
 Ephorus, 519, 540
 Ephraim, 328, 354, 368, 370, 374, 387-390,
 393
 Ephraim, 374, 390
Epic Cycle, the, 500 *sq.*
 Epidaurus, 533, 535
 Epimenides, 537
 Epirus, Illyrian peoples of, 31; dialect spoken
 in, 519 *sq.*; Dorians, 530; Zeus, 629
 Erechtheus, 620
 Eregli, 7
 Ereshkigal, 346
 Ereth, 176
 Eretria, 454
 Eriba-adad, 234, 243
Erinyes, the, 627
 Erishu, 241
 'Erwenet', the, 141
 Erythrae, 480, 552, 558
 Erz-gebirge, 21
 Esarhaddon, 345
 Esau, 352, 360, 389, 404
 Esdraefon, plain, 68, 293
 Eshmunen, 171
 Eski-shehr, 3
 Eneh, 41
 Ethonia, 38
 Eteocles, 526 *n.*
 Eteoecretan language, 289
 Ethiopians, the, 581
 Eturia, Lydian colonization of, 11 *sq.*, 287;
 Egyptian art copied in, 416
 Etruscans, 8; evidence for Lydian con-
 nection, 11 *sq.*, 24, 282, 287, 574;
 language, 12, 24; Gauls, 35; Umbrians,
 36; Faliscans, 37; Hittites, 282, 428;
 'Villanovan' civilization, 573; problem
 of origin, 573; *see* Tursna
 Euboea, 459, 480; Homeric Catalogue,
 481; Hera, 604; 'pilgrim way,' 633
 Eugammon, 501
 Euhemerus, 608
 Eulaeus river, 248
 Eumelus (Homeric), 481; (epic poet), 501
 Eumolpidae, 632
 Eunostos, 623
 Euphrates, 4, 56 *sq.*, 228, 284; Hittites, 7,
 253, 255; Armenians, 13; Amenhotep I,
 54 *sq.*; strategic importance, 68, 233;
 Thutmose III, 76 *sq.*, 79, 230; battle-
 area west of, 230; Assyrian empire
 bounded by, 239, 266
 Euphronius, 521
 Euripus, the, 454
 Europe, interrelations with Asia and
 Africa, Ch. 1; migrations, 6; Asia Minor,
 17; physical relations with Asia, 20;
 prehistoric culture, 21; racial types, 22
 sq.; extinct languages, 23 *sq.*
 Eurotas river, 479, 535
 Euryalus, 479
 Eurysacidae, the, 628
 Eurystheus, 477 *sq.*, 497
 Eurytanes, the, 31
 Eusebius, 519, 560
 Euyuk, Alaja, 15, 254, 269 *sq.*
 Exodus, O.T. narrative of the, 352 *sq.*,
 358-369, 405; theories of, 356 *n.*, 358 *sq.*,
 403 *n.*; second 'Exodus' (from Babylon),
 405
 Eye (Kheperkheperuirimare Ai), 109, 115,
 130

F. See P.
 Falerii, 563
 Faliscan dialect, 33; people, 37
 Fenni, the, 38
 Ferakdin, 270 *sq.*, 272
 Feudalism in Egypt, extinction of, 41, 196;
 Joseph, 41
 Finns, the, 39
 Flemish speech, 39
 Folkton, neolithic tomb at, 597
 Fontanella (Mantovana), 566, 571, 573
 Forli, 35
 Forum, Roman, 574
 France, northern plain, 21; palaeolithic art,
 21; palaeolithic implements, 563; 'Au-
 rignacian' culture, 580; Iberian parallels,
 585; neolithic and later, 589; sequence
 of prehistoric cultures in, 591-597, 599
 Franks, in Gaul, 34
 French language, origin of, 34
 Frisian dialects, 39

 G occurs in Egyptian-Arabic for the
 j (ج) used elsewhere (e.g. Gebel = Jebel);

- gh* represents the hard Arabic *ghain* (ح), resembling the French *r grasseye*, for which *g* is used in some systems.
- Gā'al, 388
 Gād, god and tribe, 348; tribe, 366 *sq.*
 Gadara, 312
 Gades, 379, 590
 Gaelic (Scots) language, 34
Gaesati, 37
 Gafsa, 579
 Galatae, the, 19
 Galatia, 14; monuments, 254, 270
 Galilee, Ramses II in, 148
 Galli, priests of Cybele, 19
 Ganesh; *see* Kanes
 en-Gannim, 314
 Garda, 523, 568
 Garsatūra, 259, 272, 299
 Garu, 316
 Gashga, 271
 Gashgash, 239
 Gath, 291, 293, 315, 317, 372, 380, 388, 392
 Gath-carmel, 317
 Gath-rimmōn, 314
 Gaul, Celts in, 33 *sq.*
 Gauls, migrations of, 7 *sq.*, 13, 17 *sqq.*, 24; in Britain, 34; in Spain, 34 *sq.*; in Italy, 35
 Gavr'inis, island, 592, 597
 Gaza, 291, 298, 315, 322, 361 *sq.*; Thutmose III at, 68; = (Roman) Minoa, 285, 288; Baal of, 289; theatre, 290; in O.T. narrative, 353, 359 (361), 372, 387, 390; importance of position, 380 *sq.*
 Ge, goddess, 604, 611
 Gebal, 250, 303, 305, 322, 347
Genesis, Book of, 357, 385; archaeology and, 384
 Genga, 571
 Gennesaret, 331; in O.T. narrative, 353
 Genoa, 23
 Georgian dialect, 259 (vol. I, p. 469); people, origin of, 430
 Gerar, 359, 380, 392
 German races, 37; primitive customs, 37; languages, 39
Germans, origin of term, 37
 Germany, northern plain, 21; 'Wiros,' 29; Slavonic dialects in, 33
 Gēshūr, 369
 Getae, the, 39
 Gēzer, 92, 124, 165 *sq.*, 169, 381; pottery, etc., Philistine and other, 293 *sq.*, 329 *sq.*, 333; in Amarna Letters, 312-315, 320, 342, 345 *sq.*; in O.T. narrative, 353, 357, 374, 388, 396
 Ghadames, 579, 580 *n.*
 Ghar Dalam, 575, 578
 Giaur Kaleli, 270 *sq.*
 Gibe'on, 353, 371, 374, 389 *sq.*, 397
 Gibraltar, 575, 578, 586
 Gide'on, 370, 387 *sq.*, 393
 Gilboa', 354, 372, 390
 Gile'ad, 344 *n.*, 353, 358, 368-373, 388
 391
 Gilgāl, 353, 370, 389
 Gilgamesh, 228, 388
 Gilia, 300
 Gilukhipa, 95, 234, 300
 Ginti, 315, 317
 Gina, 314
 Girgashites, the, 380 *n.*
 Gitium (?), 379
 Giupadalla, 314
 Gizeh, legend of Thutmose IV at, 91
 Gladstone, Mr, and archaeology, 276
 Glass, in Egypt, 57, 104; polychrome, 417
 Glaucidiae, the, 549
 Glaucus, 620
 Godfrey de Bouillon, 3
 Goidelic, dialect of Celtic, 596
 Golasecca, 572
 Gold, Syrian work, 329
 Golden Calf, cult of, 363 *sq.*
 'Golden Fleece,' 18, 475
 Göliath, 292, 332, 372, 389, 393
 Gordium, 543
 Gortyn, 482
 Gōshen, 353, 359, 390
 Gothic languages, 39
 Goths, Christianized, 39
 Goulas, 459, 471
 Gournia, 432, 439, 443 *sq.*, 446 *sq.*
 Granicus river, 490
 Greece, *see* Ch. xvi (Crete and Mycenae); Mycenae, 450-468; Thessaly, Macedonia (and Troy), 468-472; Pelasgians in N.W., 8; earliest inhabitants, 26 *sq.*; 'Peoples of the Sea,' 275; beechwood, in Egypt, 424
 Greek language, 25, 468; earliest alphabet, 29 *sq.*; dialects (Homeric poems), 509; dialects, in Asia Minor, 545
 Greeks, in Asia, 17; writing, 36; colonists in S. Italy, 36; migration from Balkans to Aegean, 164; 'Ha-nebu' (= G.), 277; influence in Palestine, 376; Semitic commercial terms, 378; in Greece, 468, 473; *see also* Chs. xvii (Achaean), xviii (Homer), xix (Dorians), xx (Hellenic settlement in Asia Minor), xxii (religion and mythology)
 Gubla, 340
 Gudea, 228
guenna, 245
 Guipuzcoa, 589
 Guli-addi, 346
 Gurgum, 274
 Gurob, 464
 Gyges, 560

H. As distinct from the ordinary hard breathing (ח), Hebrew has a guttural represented by *kh* or, in familiar names, by *h* (hence more correctly distinguished as *ḥ*); Arabic has a softer and a harder variety, represented by *ḥ* (ح) and *ḥ* or *kh* (خ). There is no hard breathing in

Assyrian-Babylonian, and *h* (e.g. Habiru, Hammurabi) represents *ḥ* (strictly the harder *ḥ* or *kh*); in this work *kh* is used, but *h* (*ḥ*) for familiar names. To avoid complicated transliterations *h* has been added to *k*, *s*, and *t* (which see) to express the soft consonants *kh*, *sh* and *th*; although these spellings might stand for the two consonants *k* (*s*, *t*) and the hard breathing *h*, and the doubled forms (e.g. Ashshur) are ungraceful. In transliterating Egyptian, *h* is used for the hard breathing and the guttural (viz. *ḥ*), and *kh* or *ch* commonly for the harder guttural (Arab. خ, or *ḥ*)

and another variety (*ḥ*, probably resembling the German *ch* and modern Greek χ).

- Habiru, god, 348
 Habiru, the¹, 108, 124 sq., 205, 299, 311 sq., 315, 317, 348, 356 sq., 369, 381 (and n.); see *Sa.Gaz.*
 Hadād, 348 sq., 351, 404; (Edomite), 392 sq.; (Hadar), 393
 Hadad'ēzer, 310 (and n.)
 Hades, 627, 629
 Hadōrām, 349
 Hadrumetum, 581
 Haemus, Mt, 17, 31
 Hāgār, 359 sq., 384
 Hagiār Kim, 576
 Hagias, 501
 Hagios Elias, 457
 Hair-dressing, as ethnological evidence, 278 sq.
 Halab, 262, 266, 269, 299
 Halaf, Tell, 255, 430
 Wadi Halfa, 85
 Haliartus, 480, 620
 Halicarnassus, Ionians at, 18, 519 n.; Dorians at, 529 n.
 Halisones, the, 492
 Hall, H. R., Egyptian chronology, 698
 Hallstatt civilization, 573, 593
 Ḥalpash (Aleppo), 230

- Hal-Safieni, 577
 Hal-Tarxien, 576, 578
 Halys river, 2, 4 sq., 12, 14 sq., 492 n.
 Hamath, 303, 310 (and n.), 326, 349, 377
 Hamilton, explorer of Asia Minor, 2
 Wadi Hammāmāt, 155
 Hammurabi, 227, 243, 269, 321, 377, 397, 400; kingship, 343; code, and Penta-teuch, 384 sq.; ethical aspects of code, 402
 Hāmōr, 359, 388
 'Ha-nebu' (= Ἡλλήνες), 276 sq.
 Ḥani, 241, 320; Ḥanigalbat, 228 sq., 241 sq., 250, 260, 271 sq., 273, 299 sqq., 312
 Ḥannāthōn (Khinatuna, Khinnatun), 313, 399
 Hapusenel, 61, 64
 Hapzefa, contracts made by, 211 sq.
 Harāb Jebel, 362 n.
 Harmhab (or Horemehbe, Zoserkheperure), 126, 205, 207, 214 (Horemheb), 318, 337; became Pharaoh, 130; reconstructive work, 131-135; Amon-worship, 131 sq.; fiscal laws, 132 sqq., 158, 210
 Harōsheth, 387
 Harpalyce, 618
 Harrān, 239, 241, 320, 350, 368, 377
 Harri, the, 237, 260, 263, 272, 299, 302, 304, 311
 Harrite dialect, 253
 Harūn el-Rashid, 105
 Hathor, 63, 345, 347, 419
 Hatt, see Hatti
 Hattshepsut (Ma'kere'), 60-66, 73, 97, 113, 139, 409; succession, 60 sqq.; tomb, 64; temples, 65 sq., 409 sq.
 — Meretre, 86
 Hatsho, 176
 Hatti (Eg. Kheta, q.v., Heb. Heth, 256, 271), 15, 242, 249, 275, 301, 303, 306, 319, 331, 378, 558; an ethnical term only, 252 (see Ch. xi); language, 252, 331; unknown origin, 259; rise and fall of dynasty, 260-269, 547 sq.; 'the land,' 266; allied states, 271-274; H. in Amarna Age, 297-302, 318; see Hittites
 Hattic, 'proto-', 253
 Hattushash, 256, 266, 271; see Boghaz Keui
 Hattushilish (-ish is a case ending; Semitic Hattushili, Eg. Khetasil[e]), 240 sq., 256, 299; alliance with Ramses II, 149 sqq., 240, 260 n., 265 sqq., 272 sq.; date, 260 n.; his reign, 265-267, 302, 319 sq., 333, 343; art, 270 sq.
 Hatushar, 249
 Haurān, 135, 148, 345
 Ḥazā'el, 345
 Ḥāzōr, 311, 325 sq., 357, 370

¹ It is disputed whether the name philologically represents the 'Hebrews' (*'ibriim*), or is an appellative, meaning 'allies'; see for the former, Burney, *Judges*, p. lxxiv sq. (note), and for the latter, Dhorme, *Rev. Bib.* 1924, p. 14 sq.

- Hebrew traditions of Egyptian empire, 49,
see Joseph; of escape from Egypt, 153;
 O.T. records, 256, 296, 357; 'Caphtor',
 275, 279, 286; 'Philistines', 284; dialect,
 332 *sq.*; humour, 338; kingship, 346,
 394; religious thought, 401
- Hebrews in Palestine, 135, 299, 350, 376;
 enmity to Philistines, 381; = Habiru (*q.v.*),
 381
- Hebrōn, 352 *sqq.*, 358, 360 *sq.*, 365, 367,
 372 *sq.*, 392
- Hebrus river, 31
- Hecataeus, 538
- Hecate, 634 *sq.*
- Hector, 487, 499 *sq.*, 505, 511, 515, 625
- Hecuba, 4
- Helen, 477, 491, 500, 512, 539, 626
- Helenus, 487
- Heliadae, the, 552
- Heliopolis, vizier at, 44; temple, 49, 73, 79,
 181, 183; Aton, 111; Seti I, 138;
 Ikhnaton, 206; law-court at, 210, 214;
 Joseph, and priesthood of, 360 *n.*
- Hēlios, as god, 611, 632
- 'Helladic,' meaning of term, 452 *sq.*; late,
 452; middle, 452; peoples, 454; pottery,
 469, 471 *sq.*; late pottery in Thessaly,
 469 *sq.*
- Hellas (near Mount Oēta), 481
- Helle, 618
- Hellenes, 474, 481, 526, 530
- Hellenic migration to Aegean, 164; Asia
 Minor, 496; Ch. xx (main traditions,
 542-548; resistance of Ionia and its
 cause, 548-553; earlier 'Caro-Lelegian'
 civilization, 553-558; process of H.
 settlement, 558-562)
- Hellespont, and Pelasgians, 8; Indo-Euro-
 peans, 12; Bryges, 284; power of Troy,
 490; Odysseus, 507
- Helos, 540
- Helots, the, 540
- Hephaestus, 482, 500, 505, 516, 616, 626,
 637 *sq.*
- Hera, 485, 544, 604, 616 *sq.*, 630 *sq.*, 637
- Heracleia (Pontica), 559
- Heracles, 477 *sq.*, 482, 497, 527, 606, 609,
 620, 626; dynasty restored, 496
- Heracids, return of the, 496, 518, 525, 531,
 538
- Hercynian Forest, 35
- Herenkeru (?), 344
- Hermæ, the, 606, 642
- Hermes, 510, 637
- Kourotophos, 637
- Psychopompos, 637
- Hermione, marriage of, 485, 496; descent,
 497
- Hermione (city), 458, 533 *sq.*
- Hermōn, 311, 353
- Hermionassa, 556
- Hermonthis, 111
- Hermopolis, 171
- Hermus river, 3 *sq.*, 492, 496, 544, 548
- Herod, 367
- Herodotus, and Pelasgians, 8, 526; Milyas,
 9; Carians, 10; Lydians and Etruria, 11,
 574; Armenians, 13; Scythians, 32;
 Dorians, 526 *sq.*, 530-532, 535, 537, 539;
 Hellenic settlements in Asia Minor, 542;
 Leleges, 556; Libyans, 581; Dodona, 612
- Heroic Age, 479, 511 *sqq.*
- Herzegovina, 530
- Heshbōn, 366
- Hesiod, and Leleges, 26; and iron-workers,
 524; the *Aegimius*, 527; systematized
 mythology, 603, 605 *sq.*, 608, 610;
 after-life, 627; Hecate, 634; Kore (Per-
 sephone), 636
- Hestia, 616
- hetairai*, 484
- Heth; *see* Hatti
- Hieraconpōlis, 53
- Hierapytna, 528 (*and n.*)
- hike'* (*māgic*), 199, 201; its power, 202 *sq.*;
 relation to ethics, 201 *sq.*, 210, 402; *see*
also I, p. 354 *sq.*; reaction on priest-
 hood, 202 *sq.*, 204
- Hippo, 581
- Hippocrates, and Scythians, 32 (*and n.*)
- Hirām, 396
- Hissarlik, Ch. xx, 257, 489, 511, 543 *sqq.*,
 558, 567
- Histiactotis, 527
- Hittites, 1 (Eg. Kheta, cuneiform Hatti,
q.v.); and modern Armenians, 5; in
 Egyptian art, 6; early art of, 7; relations
 with Egypt, 7; Boghaz Keui (*q.v.*), 13;
 = White Syrians, 14; Tyana, 15; native
 populations, 16; cuneiform writing, 57,
 130 *n.*, 228; Syria, 57; Thutmose III,
 77, 231; Thutmose IV and Mitanni, 92;
 Amenhotep III, 107; rise of empire in
 Asia Minor, 122, 237 *sq.*; war with
 Seti I, 136 *sq.*, with Ramses II, 141-147,
 265, 382, 487; advance into Palestine,
 148; alliance with Ramses, 149 *sqq.*, 265
sq., 330, 338, 347; commerce with Egypt,
 54; alliance broken, 165, 169; power in
 Syria broken by northern invaders, 174;
 Ramses III, 176 *sq.*; H. hostility to
 Egypt, 231, 239; break-up of power,
 248; H. of Asia Minor, Ch. xi (name,
 distribution, sources, 252-256; earliest
 period, Cappadocia, 256-259; rise and
 fall of Hatti dynasty, 260-269; civiliza-
 tion, 269-274); 'Hittite' a cultural term
 (*see* Hatti, Hattic); area of culture, 253;
 sources of knowledge: linguistic, 253 *sq.*,
 archaeological, 254 *sq.*; foreign records,
 255 *sq.*; Hebrew (O.T.) references, 256;
 Semitic (Assyrian) influence in language

- and art, 258 *sq.*; unknown origin, 259; nature of empire, 268 *sq.*; codified law, 269; art: early, 269 *sq.*, second, or Cappadocian, period, 270 *sq.*, 273; *see also* 427 *sq.*; Champollion's 'Schéto,' 275; relation to Etruscans, 282; users of iron, 292; connection with Amorites, 319; meaning of name, 376 *n.*; connection with Israel, 386; 'Kanesian' texts, 428 *n.*; Anatolian remains, 548
- Hiv(v)ites, 380 *n.*, 537
- Höbáb, 362
- Homer, 5 *n.*, 10 *n.*; Ch. XVIII (the Homeric poems, 498–501; the Homeric controversy, 502–510; historical substratum, 510–517); Phoenician traders, 58; Mycenae, 460, 466, Ch. XVIII; Achaeans, 474; birth-place, 501; date, 507; Dorians, 528, 541
- Homeric Catalogue, 479–482, 494, 504, 523
- Homeric Controversy, 502–510; theories of D'Aubignac and Wolf, 502 *sqq.*, 506; expansion theories (Grote, v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff), 504–506; dialects, 509, 535; vocabulary, 510; the *digamma*, 510 *n.*; heroes of Trojan War, problem of historical reality, 511 *sq.*; Homer's consistent archaism, 513 *sqq.*; use of Olympian machinery, 515 *sq.*
- Homeric poems, 303, 478 *sq.*, 498–501; material background, 432; *Iliad*, 498 *sqq.*; *Odyssey*, 500; *Thebaid* and *Cypria* (?), 501; authorship and date, 506 *sq.*; rhapsodes, 507 *sq.*; writing used, 508; comparison with Teutonic poems, 511 *sqq.*; topography, 512 *sqq.*; literary qualities, 516 *sq.*; mythology systematized and moralized, 603, 605–608
- Homeric religion, 616, 624–629; the Olympian gods, 629–638
- Homs, lake, 262, 265, 293, 319; *see* Emesa
- Hörām, 357
- Höreb, 361 *sq.*, 365, 377, 404
- Horemheb, 214; *see* Harnhab
- Horites, the, 316, 367
- Hörmah, 359, 365
- Höronālm, 326
- Horse, the, in Egypt, 43, 227; international importance, 227 *sq.*; in Babylonia, 244
- Horus, 201, 206; (Re), 203 *sq.*
- Hrihor, 192, 194 *sq.*, 209, 224
- Hungary, plain of, 20; 'Wiros,' 29
- Hyacinthia*, the, 539
- Hyksos, the, 40 *sqq.*, 53, 56, 60, 62, 65, 67, 78, 81, 83, 98, 151, 159, 164, 189, 195, 215, 223, 227, 277 *n.*, 293 *n.*, 296 *sq.*, 347, 399; and Israelite Exodus, 356 *n.*, 358; influence on Egyptian art, 408 *sq.*, 416, 420, 425; introduction of chariot, 423
- Hylle, 538 *n.*
- Hylleis, the, 525, 527 *sq.*, 538 *n.*
- Hyllus, 497, 526 *sq.*, 533 *sq.*
- Hymettus, Mt, etymology, 25, 467
- Hypanis river, 32
- Hypothebae, 477, 480
- I.* In the spelling of Arabic words *i* is often represented by *e* (e.g. Hejāz, Hijāz). In Egyptian *i* is often represented by *a* (see Aahmes, Ikhnaton).
- Ialysia, tribe, 529 *n.*
- Ialysus, 482, 529, 537, 552
- Iapygians, the, 36
- Iasos, 544, 559
- Iberian inscriptions, 23; people, and Sicani, 24; Celts, 35; peninsula: palaeolithic period, 585 *sq.*; kitchen-middens, 586; neolithic age, 587; megaliths, 587 *sqq.*; 'beaker'-pottery, 589; copper and bronze, 589 *sq.*; external relations, 590
- 'Ibero-Ligurii,' 564 *n.*, 567, 571 *n.*, 574, 583
- Ibi-sin, 257
- Ible'am, 387
- ibri*, 322
- Ibrim, 54, 93
- Icarius, 620
- Ice Age, in Europe, 21
- Iconium, 255, 270, 273
- Ictinus, 408
- Ida, mount (Troad), 487 *sq.*, 495
- Idaeae Dactyls, 524
- Id Deb-dieba, 577
- Idin-Teshub, 318
- Idomeneus, 443, 482, 492
- Idumaea; *see* Antipater, Edom
- Ikathi, 89 *sq.*
- Ikaushu; *see* Achish
- Ikhnaton (Akhenaton, Ekhneten), 86, 235, 297, 300 *sq.*, 303, 329, 335, 336, 345; Ch. VI (I.'s religious movement, 109–121; foreign situation and fall of I., 121–130); theory of Aton, 111 *sq.*; persecution of Amon, 112 *sqq.*, 378; alleged body of I., 113 *n.*; origin of name, 113, 204; Aton-cities, 114 *sq.*; I.'s party, 115 *sq.*; Amarna cemetery, 116 *sq.*; Aton-hymns, 117 *sqq.*; I.'s personal belief, 120; decline of imperial power, 121–127, 298, 305 *sq.*, 308, 317 *sq.*; opposition of priests and army, 126 *sq.*; death of I., 127; I.'s significance, 127 *sq.*, 403; culmination of his religious work, 160; *see also* Ch. IX, i (effect of priestly power, 201 *sq.*; complex origin of movement, 203 *sqq.*; I.'s personal achievement, 206; causes of failure, 207); influence on art, 411, 413
- ilānu*, 350 (*cf.* 341 *n.*, 400 *n.*)
- Ilbaba-shum-iddin, 244, 246
- Ikād*, the, 498 *sqq.*, 556; 'expansion'

- theories, 504 *sq.*; authorship, 506 *sq.*;
Little I., 500 *sq.*, 505; *see* Homer
- Ilians, 281
- Ilienses, 583
- Ilion, Ilios, Ilium, 12, 282, 471, 488 *n.*; *see*
 Hissarlik, Troy
- Ilissos river, 27
- Ilithyia, 615
- Iliunna (?), 281 *sq.*
- Illahun (el-Lāhūn), 191
- Illyria, 24 *sq.*; Dorians, 531
- Illyrian language, 24 *sq.*; people, and
 Philip II, 26; Sicily, 37; Pelasgians, 476;
 I. in Italy, 572
- Illyricum, and Troy, 490
- Ilu ('god'), 349
- Ilu-bi'di, 349
- Ilus, 490, 627
- Imbrus, 18, 495
- Immiriya, 242 *n.*
- Inachus river, 533
- India, migrations, 6; Indo-Eur. languages,
 25
- Indo-Europeans, contact with Europe, Ch.
 I, iii (12-19), 430; language, 13; speakers,
 15, 23 *sq.*; guttural and sibilant groups,
 25; vocabulary, home, climate, etc., 29;
 'Hattic' probably I.-E., 253 *sq.*; Hatti
 an I.-E. people (?), 259; 'terremare' folk,
 569; influence on Greek religion, 612
sqq.; *see* Aryan
- Indo-Iranian gods, 331, 400 *sq.*
- Indra; *see above*
- 'Indulgences' (Egypt), 51
- Ineni, 59, 61, 64
- Ino-Leucothea, 615, 626
- Intef, 78, 84
- Iolcus, 17, 454 *sq.*, 469 *sq.*, 475, 481, 544
- Ionian Is., 459
- Ionians = Pelasgians (?), 8; colonies, 18,
 532; identity of, 275, 281, 532, 536;
 = 'Iāvones', 514; and Dorians, 518 *sq.*;
 I. migration to Asia Minor, 543; I. =
 'Greeks' generally, 545; 'proto-Ionian
 theory', 551
- Ionic dialect, 467, 520
- Iphigenia, 634
- Ipuwer, prophecies of, 279; *see* I, p. 344
- Iran, 259
- Iranians, 13; language, 13 *n.*, 17, 25;
 Mitanni, 58; names, in Syria, 331
- Ireland, round stone huts in, 578; con-
 nection with Iberian cultures, 590;
 'barrows', 594; stone circles, 595
- Irem, 82
- Iris river, 4
- Irish language, 34
- Iriunna, 282
- Irkata (*cf.* O.T. 'Arķite'), 304, 309, 339,
 342
- Iron, from Asia Minor, 5; smelted, for
 Egypt, 267, 272; used by Philistines,
 292; in Greece, 294; Late Minoan III
 period, 446, 523 *sq.*
- Iron Age, beginning of, in Aegean, 427,
 431, 446 *sq.*, 466; transition from Bronze
 Age, 467, 470, 472, 484, 522; iron in
 Homer, 513; Achaeans and Dorians, 522;
 early Iron (Villanovan) Age, in Italy,
 571 *sq.*, in France, 593
- Irriya, 244
- Irrupi, 249
- Isaac, 359 *sq.*, 368, 392, 394
- Isauria, 16, 273
- Isbarta, 554 *sq.*
- Ish-bā'āl, 372 *sq.*, 389
- Ish-bōsheth, 372
- Ishin, 243; *see* Isin
- Ishmā'el, 359 *sq.*
- Ishme-Dagan, 377
- Ishtar, 250, 300, 330, 340; of Nineveh, 108,
 344; temple at Ashur, 232; gate of
 Babylon, 430; *cf.* Ashirat, Astarte
- Ishuwa, 237, 261, 299, 301
- Isin, 245; *cf.* Pashē
- Isis, 201, 345
- 'Isles, Men of the', 277, 286, 414
- Ismarus, mount, 492
- Isopata, 441
- Isrā'el = Jacob, 352, 358, 369, 404
 — (people), 165, 169 *sq.*, 289, 296, 320;
 nature of kingship, 342; rise of, Ch. xiv
 (O.T. narrative, 352-358; account of
 the Exodus and the Conquest, 358-369;
 account of the rise of the monarchy,
 369-375; Palestine, Phoenicia and the
 Philistines, 376-381; Israel, Judah, and
 King Saul, 381-391; David and Solo-
 mon, 392-397; some contemporary ideas,
 397-402; various connotations in O.T.,
 355; I., partly Edomite, 368; strife with
 Judah, 373; end of monarchy, 378; in-
 fluence of Arabia, 380; rise of Yahwism,
 404 *sq.*
- Israelites, in Egypt, 154; wars with
 Philistines, 284, 291 *sq.*; I. in Palestine,
 376, 381; problem of autonomy, 382-
 391; historical value of O.T. narrative,
 383 *sq.*; theory of Aramaean origin, 405
- Issus, 56, 272, 283 (*and n.*), 284
- Isua, 250
- Itakama, 123, 307, 309-311, 340; *see*
 Aitakkama
- Italic dialects, 25; and Celtic, 33
- Italy, *see* Ch. XXI; 563-574; Pelasgians in,
 8; 'Peoples of the Sea', 275; 'Tursha',
 276; palaeolithic remains, 563; neolithic
 remains, 563 *sqq.*; 'terremare' folk in,
 568-571; early Iron Age in, 571 *sq.*
- Ithaca, 480, 491, 500, 512, 531
- Iuua, tomb of, 415 *sq.*, 423 *sq.*
- Ivritz, rock-carving, 7

Ƴ. In biblical names and German transliterations *j* corresponds to English *y*. There is no *j* in Hebrew. In Egyptian Arabic *j* (ج) is a hard *g*.

Jabesh (Gilead), 371 *sq.*, 390
 Jabin (Yabin), 357, 370
 Jacob, 324, 336, 352, 357, 370; in O.T. narrative, 358–360, 368 *sq.*; = Israel, 369, 389, 404; connotation of name, 394, 404
 Jacob-baal, 377
 Jacob-el, 377
 Jarmuth, 324, 353
Jashar, Book of, 354, 372
 Jason, 17, 30, 475, 478, 631
 Javan, 546 *sq.*, 559; see *Yāwān*
 Jaxartes river, 32
 Jebusites, the, 354, 371, 374
 Jēdīdiah, 393, 397
 Jehōiākim, 349
 Jehōrām, 348
 Jehovah, 353 *n.*; see *Yahweh*
 Jehōzādāk, 397
 Jēhū, 364 *sq.*, 391
 Jenin, 314
 Yenoam; see *Yenoam*
 Jephthah (Yiphthāh), 370, 372, 388 *sq.*
 Jerablūs (Jerābūs), 269
 Jerāhmē'el, 367, 375
 Jericho, 350, 353, 370, 384
 Jerobo'am (Yārobo'am), 363, 371, 388, 391 *n.*, 392
 Jerubba'al, 387
 Jerusalem, 124, 165, 298, 312, 381 *sq.*; in Amarna Letters (Urusalim, 396), 315–317, 321 *sq.*, 332, 342; temple, 346; in O.T. narrative, 353 *sq.*, 371, 374, 384, 390, 398, 402; David, 393; Ikhnaton's city, 399
 Jethro, 353, 361 *sq.*, 395
 Jews, not seafarers, 380; 'European' type, 382
 Jezebel (Izēbēl), 396
 Jeze'el, 135, 313, 320, 387, 390
 Jihun, 4
 Joab, 290, 373
 'Job, Stone of', 319, 345
 Jōnāthān, 372, 374
 Joppa, 84, 223, 313 *sq.*, 322, 327, 380, 388
 Jōrām, 349
 Jōrdān river, 56, 353, 384; Seti I, 135
 Jōseph, 41, 45, 154, 355, 358, 360 (*and n.*), 368, 374; protector of the people, 48; and Poup̄har's wife, 223; = ? Yankhamu, 324; tribe of, in O.T., 370, 374, 390, 394
 Josephus, 502
 Jōshūā', 344; in O.T., 356, 359 *sqq.*, 364 *sq.*, 369 *sqq.*, 389, 391 (*and n.*), 392
Joshua, Book of, 356, 360

Jōthām, 388
 Judah, hills of, 55; (state), 296; see Ch. xiv, *esp.* 381–391; separation from Israel, 354, 363; 'Judah's' marriage, 359; tribe of, in O.T., see 365–394; strife with Israel, 373; end of monarchy, 378
 Judaism, 593
Judges, Book of, 355, 386
 Julian Alps, 20
 Julius Caesar, in Gaul, 39; on Britain, 593
 Jupiter, planet, 218
 Jura mountains, 20, 591
 Jutland, 33; Germans in, 38

K. For the emphatic *k* (ك, ك), as distinct from the ordinary *k* (or *c*, چ, ج), some systems prefer *q*. In cuneiform *k* is often written *g*. *kh* is used to avoid the alternative transliteration *k* (strictly *ḳ*); see under *H*.

el-Kab, native princes of, 40 *sq.*; feudal survival, 41; high-priest at, 189
 Kadashman-Enlil, 94; I, 233 *sq.*; II, 240, 242, 244, 267, 320
 Kadashman-Kharbe, 235 *sq.*, 301; II, 243
 Kadashman-Turgu, 240
 Kadesh, goddess, 159, 347, 402
 Kadesh (on the Orontes), 55 *n.*; kingdom, 56 *sq.*, 240, 307, 310, 326, 344 (*and n.*), 377; revolt against Thutmose III, 67 *sq.*, 70–76; T.'s final campaign, 75 *sq.*, 78; further revolt, 82 *sq.*; in power of Hittites, 123, 137, 141; attacked by Ramses II, 142 *sqq.*, 146 *sq.*, 161, 223, 260 *n.*, 265, 487; coloured relief of R., 156 *sq.*; Ramses III. 176; plan of K., 145
 —barnea (S. Palestine), 344, 353, 361 *sq.*, 365, 368, 390, 391 *n.*, 404
 —(Naphtali), 344, 367, 386
 Kadi, 243
 Kahun papyri, 213, 216
 Kaisāriyeh, 257
 Kakovatos, 455, 479
 Kala'at Sherkat, 258, 429, 430 (*and n.*)
 Kalabshah, 85
kalb, 322
 Kalifatli-Asmak, 489
 Kalikisha, 281, 380 *n.*, 488
 Kali-Teshub, 249
 Kamares Cave, 614
 Kānah, 311, 326
 Kanes (Ganes), 6, 253, 257, 272¹
 Kanesian dialect, 253 *sq.*; texts of Boghaz Keui, 428 *n.*
 Kantara, 38, 68, 153
 Kapakli, 455, 470

¹ The identification with Caesarea Mazaca is considered doubtful by Lewy, S. Smith, etc

- Kara-Euyuk (the mound is called Kültepe, *q.v.*), 253, 257, 377
 Kara-Indash, 233, 235 *n.*
 Karaja Dag, 249
 Kara-Khardash, 235 (*and n.*)
 Karduniash, 240, 242 *sq.*, 311 *sq.*
 Kar-Marduk, 246
 Karnak, 8; Thutmose (III) of, 60, 65 *sq.*, 73 *sq.*; Thutmose IV, 92 *sq.*; Amenhotep III, 101 *sq.*, 112; Ikhnaton, 113 *sq.*, 132, 205; Seti I, 136, 138, 180; Ramses II, 140, 147, 150, 152, 155; Seti II, 171; Ramses III, 179; temple of Amon, 189 *sq.*, 224, 279; Thutmose III's buildings, 410
 Karneia, the, 525
 Karoy, 90, 106
 Karsaūra, 259, 271; *see* Garsaūra
 Kash, 271 *sq.*, 273 *sq.*, 304
 Kashiari, 241, 249
 Kashkā, 239; *see below*
 Kashkai, 249, 271
 Kashshi, 313, 317, 330
 Kashtiliash, I, 242 *n.*; II, 237; III, 242 (*and n.*)
 Kassite dynasty at Babylon, 58, 227, 229 *sq.*, 385; and Assyria, 232, 234, 236 *sq.*, 241; overthrown by A., 242 *sq.*; K. régime, 244; local government, 245; dress, 245; Hittite alliance, 264 *sq.*, 267, 320; K. names, 332; divine emblems, 346; culture, 429; *see* Kashshi
 Katna, 107, 263, 301, 310, 340, 345; Ketne, 148
 Kedi, 267 *sq.*; *see* Kode
 Keftians, Keftiu, 7, 98, 148, 219, 275, 286, 438, 547; *see also* Ch. XII (275-283); = Keftōyew, 58; in Egyptian art, 278, 414; = 'Kefatiu,' 279 *sq.*; language, 280 (*and n.*), 332; meaning of term K., 280, 287; = ? Crete, 286; influence on Egyptian art, 420
 Kehek, the, 172, 177, 326
 Ke'illah, 315 *sq.*, 331
 Kemed, 319; *see* Kumid
 Kenaz, 375
 Kenites, the, 367, 375, 385 *sq.*
 Keper, 175 *sq.*
 Kēr, 628
 Keramos, 628
 Kereth, Kērēthi (Kerēhim), 285 *sq.*, 288 *sq.*
 Kertch, 32
 Keshkesh, 488 *n.*
 Ketne, 148; *see* Katna
 Kezwenen, 141; *see* Kissuwadna
 Khabiru; *see* Habiru
 Khabur river, 250, 263
 Khafre, 91
 Khalki, and χαλκός, 5 *n.*
 Khalman, 262
 Khalpa, 262, 301
 Khalunni, 311
 Khamwese, 162
 Khani, 124, 308
 Khanigalbat; *see* Hanigalbat
 Khanikin, 239
 Kharabu, 314
 Kharbi-shipak, 247
 Kharu, 313 *n.*, 316, 320, 381
 Khatti; *see* Hatti
 khazan, 321; khazannu, 245
 Khazi, 331, 338
 Khephren, 212
 Kheta, the, 7; Thutmose III and, 77, 82 *sq.*; Thutmose IV, 92; Mitanni, 92; empire in Asia Minor, 122; Ramses II, 149; vague use of name, 280, 284 (Eg. name for the Hatti, Hittites, *q.v.*)
 Khiba (Khipa), 332, 400
 Khilakku, the, 274; = Κίλικες, 283
 Khinnatun, 399
 Khnum, 182, 184
 Khonsu, 151, 159, 194 *sq.*, 330
 Khubannumena, 242 *n.*
 Khunnuhat-nanā, 244 *n.*
 Khurbatilla, 236
 Khuy, 219
 Kidin-khutrutash, 242 *sq.*
 Kiliktepe, 555
 Kili-Teshub, 249
 Killis, 262
 Kilti, 315
 Kinakhkhi, the (Canaanites, *q.v.*), 232
 Kings, Book of, 395
 Kingship, divine, 394, 402
 Kinza, 262 *sq.*, 310
 Kirjath-'anāb, 326
 —je'arim, 315, 373 *sq.*
 —sannah, 336
 —sēpher, 326, 336, 353, 367
 Kish, 6
 Kishōn river, 386
 Kissuwadna (better Kizzuwadna), 141, Ch. XI, iii, iv (*esp.* 271 *sq.*), 283 *n.*, 292, 299; relations with Egypt, 318 *sq.*; *see* Kode
 Kitchen-middens, in Spain and Portugal, 586
 Kitium, 546
 Kizil Irmak, 4; *see* Halys
 Kizli Hissar, 269
 Kode, 141, 150 *sq.*, 283 *n.*, 284, 319, 321; *see* Kizzuwadna
 Kōrah, 363, 367
 Korākou, 451, 459, 462, 465, 525
 Korē, 636
 Koumasa, 444
 Kowaik, 262
 kreion, 482
 Krētagenēs, 285, 289
 Kubbān, 139
 Kudur-Enlil, 242
 kudurru, 244 *sq.*

- Kultepe (the village is called Kara-Euyuk, *q.v.*), 4, 6
 Kumanî, 250, 266, 272
 Kumid(i), 123, 311, 319, 324, 341
 Kummeh, 85
 Kummukh, 249
 Kurdish element in Assyria, 430
 Kurigalzu, 301; II, 94, 232 *sq.*, 238, 243; III, 236 *sq.*, 244
 Kurna, temple, 138, 410
 Kurtî, the, 249 *sq.*
 Kuru pass, 255
 Kush, 54, 85, 89, 129, 158, 177, 182, 195; *see* Nubia
 Kussar, 299
 Kutî, 238, 241
 Kutir-nakhhunte, 244
 Kutmukh, 238
- L.* There is no sign for *l* in Egyptian; it appears as *r* or as *n*; cf. the variants noted *s.v.* Zakkal.
- Labân, 336, 369 *sq.*
 — land, 258
 Labaya, 312 *sqq.*, 315 *sqq.*, 327
 Labnana (= Lebanon?), 263
 Labraunda, 288
 Labyadae, the, 632
 Labyrinth, the, 288
 Lacedaemon, 477, 479, 540
 Lâchîsh, 124, 315, 322, 325, 341, 353, 357
 Laconia, 460, 475, 483, 532, 535, 537, 538–541
 Lade, island, 3
 Laguna de la Janda, 'Chellean' imple-
 ments, 585
 Lâish, 369
 Lake-dwellings, 567 *sq.*
 Lampedusa, 582, 599
 Lampsacus, 552, 557
 Langâda pass, 541
 Langdon, S., Babylonian chronology, 696 *n.*
 Laomedon, 18, 30
 Laothoe, 488
 Lapana (= Lebanon?), 263
 La Pasiega, 585
 Lapiths, the, 527 *sq.*
 Larisa, 488
 Larymna, 481
 'La Tène' civilization, 593, 595
 Latin, place amongst European languages,
 24 *sq.*, 33, 253, 569
 Latini, the, 36
 Latium, 36, 563, 571, 574
 Laws, Egyptian code of, 47
 Lead, Syrian, 329
 Le'âh, 368
 Lēbānōn, 55, 300, 326; cedar, in Egypt,
 59, 92, 178, 192 *sqq.*, 224, 424; Thut-
 moe III, 72, 82; Amenhotep II, 89;
 Thutmose IV, 92; Seti I, 135 *sq.*, 329;
 cedar, in Assyria, 250; late Mycenaean
 graves, 293; O.T. references, 353, 388; *see*
 Labnana
 Lebedos, 552 *sq.*
 Lebu; *see* Libyan
 Lecce, 563
 Lechaicum, 451, 459
 Leleges, 10, 16, 26 *sq.*, 473, 544, 552; in
 Troad, 488; earlier 'Caro-Iclegian'
 civilization, 553–558; status, 556
 Lelex, 27
 Lemnos, Pelasgians in, 8, 531; bas-relief,
 11 *sq.*, 24; Aeolians, 18; first Greek
 settlement in, 475, 493 *sq.*; trade, 490
 Leptis Magna, 581
 Leshos, 491, 495, 518, 536, 545, 552;
 (town), 495; dialect, 509
 Lesches, 501
 Lessini, Monti, 565
 Lettish dialect, 25, 33
 Leucadia, 27
 Leucas, 480, 620
 Levant, peoples of the, Ch. XII
 Lēvi, 359, 367 *sq.*, 370; Levites, 363 *sq.*, 368
Leviticus, Book of, 364
 Lexicographical tablets ('Hattic'), 254
 Lianokladi, 523, 530 *n.*
 Libnâh, 353
 Libya, 583
 Libyan tribes in W. Delta, 8, 53, 136, 162
sq., 165; mercenaries, 155; application of
 name, 166, 280, 581; invasion of Egypt
 by, 166 *sqq.*; repulsed by Merneptah,
 167 *sqq.*, 486; incursions renewed, 172–
 176, 320 *sq.*
 Licymnius, 529
 Ligurian language, 23; palaeolithic remains,
 563; race (Ligures), 564
 Ligyes, the, 14
 Lindus, 482, 529, 552
 Lingones, the, 35
 Linus, 620
 Litāny river, 137
 Lithobolia, the, 623
 Lithuanian dialect, 25, 33
 Lixus, 379, 581
 Iocrians, 480; ? = Leleges, 27
 Lōd (? Lydda), 380
 Lombardy, prehistoric, 507
 Lophis, 620
 Los Millares, 582
 Lōt, 352, 360, 366, 389
 Lotus, 330
 Lough Crew, 594, 597
 Lough Gur, 595
 Lubdi, 251
 Ludd, 291
 Lūdim, 291
 Luka (Lycians), 275, 281 *sq.*, 284, 488;
 Lukki, 281
 Lulumā, 239

- Lupakku, 309
 Luvian dialect, 253
 Luxor, temple of Amon at, 101; Ikhnaton, 114; Amenhotep III, 138; Ramses II, 147, 152 sq.
 Lycaeus, Mt, 618
 Lycaon, 618
 Lycaonia, 7, 15; language, 15 n.; monuments, 254 sq.
 Lycastus, 482
 Lychnitis, lake, 26
 Lycia, 4, 560; people, 16; pirates, 98, 141, 165, 167, 343; Troy, 490; Greeks of, 549
 Lycians, 8 sq., 287, 492 sq.; law of descent, 9; = Luka, 275, 281 sq., 284, 488; Phaestus disk, 278; Philistines, 288, 427
 Lyctus, 482
 Lycurgus, 502
 Lycus river, 4
 Lydda, 291, 380
 Lydia, Hittite culture, 252, 270 sq.; Sardes site, 543; see Lydda
 Lydian empire, 4, 16; race, 10, 12, 287, 549, 552; Etruria, 11, 24, 282, 287; Alyattes, name, 332
 Lydus, 10
 Lyncestis, 31
 Lyrnessus, 488
 Lyttos, 291, 380
- M.* In Assyrian *m* frequently becomes *w*.
- Mā'ācah, 369
 Ma'at, 399
 Macaria, 540
 Macedonia, Philip II of, 26; language, etc., 31, 468-472; Mycenaean commerce, 460; Mycenaean culture, 471; Brygi, 487; 'Makednoi,' 526; royal line, 528; see Ch. xvi
 Māchlr, 358, 369 sq.
 Machpēlāh, 385
 Mada, Madai, Madei, 15
 Maecander river, 3, 492, 548, 559; course, 4
 Maecones, Maeconians, 10 sq., 492 sq.; country, 281
 Maer, 319
 'Magdalenian' implements and rock-paintings in Spain, 585
 Wadi Maghāra, 65
 Magic, a reactionary influence in Egypt, 202, 215, 219, 330 n.
 Magical formulae of the dead (Egypt); *ushabtis*, 51; 'Book of the Dead,' 197-200
 Magnesia, 4, 544, 548; (Sipylos), 552; (Maecander), 559
 Māhānkīm, 372
 Māhāneh-dān, 314 n.
 Mahar-baal, 187
 Mahdist attacks on Egypt, 40
maher, 326 sq., 331
 Mai, 116
 Mail, coats of, 329
 Majorca, 584
 'Makednoi,' 526
 Makere-Hatshepsut, 60; see Hatshepsut
 Malaria, 3 sq.
 Malatia, 250, 273
 Malea, Cape, 535
 Malian Gulf, 454, 475, 481, 520
malik, 322
 Mallia, 432
 Mallus, 545, 547
 Malta, 575, 582, 597, 599
 Maltese Is., prehistoric civilization, 575-581
mamōas, 589
 Manahath, 314, 388; -dan, 314 n.
 Manakhate, 314; see above
 Mānāšeh, 368, 370, 387, 390
 Manda, the, 15
 Mandaic dialect, 253
 Manetho, 172
 Mānōah, 288
 Mantova, 568
 Manx language, 34
 Marah, 361
 Mar'ash, 255, 269
marayna, 324; see *marianni*
 Mardin, 238 sq.
 Marduk, 242, 247, 342
 — apal-iddin, 244
 — nadin-akhē, 248, 251
 — shapik-zeri, 246 sq.
 Mārēshah, 315, 379
 Māri, 242
 Mariandyni, 14
marianni, 328, 331; see *marayna*
 Marmara, sea of, 17, 561; formation, 20
 Marmariene, 470
 Marnas, god, 285
 Marrite, 251
 Mars, planet, 218
 Martu, 250
 Masa (Mysians, *q.v.*), 275, 281 sq., 488
 Mashauasha, 276, 282; see Meshwesh
 Maspero, 276
 Massah, 361
masšbāh, 344 n.
 Matai, 15
 Matera, 565
 Mathematics in Egypt, 215-218; fractions, 216; mensuration (area and volume), 217 sq.
 Matieni, 141; = Medes, 15
 Matnefrure, 151
 Matrensa, 565
 Mattiuaa, 122, 237 sq., 262, 302, 331, 348, 350, 400
 Maunna, 281
 Mauretania, 379
 Maxyes, the, 166, 276, 282; see Mashauasha

- Mazaca (Caesarea), 254 *sq.*, 257, 274
 Mazki, 274; *see* Mushki
 Medea, 18
 Medes, identification, 15
 Media, 17
 Medicine, Egyptian, 219 *sqq.*; Syrian, 330
 Medinet Habū (Thebes), 113, 283 *n.*, 410
sq.; Amon-temple of Ramses III, 178
sqq., 183, 321
 Mediterranean, eastern, and Egypt, 1, Chs.
 III-VIII; Cretan culture, 58; coast-lands,
 struggle for, 227-240; Hittite and
 Egyptian, 231; Assyrian campaigns, 250;
 peoples of Levant, Ch. XII; Keftians and
 'Peoples of the Sea,' 275-283; Philistine
 migration, 283-288; Phil. civilization in
 Canaan, 289-295; 'Ha-nebu,' 276 *sq.*;
 coast of Palestine, 289
 — western, Ch. XXI; Italy and Sicily, 563-
 574; Maltese Is. and N. Africa, 575-581;
 Sardinia, Corsica and Balearic Is., 581-
 584; Iberian peninsula, 585-591; France
 and British Is., 591-597; the megalith-
 builders, 597-601; intercourse with
 Aegean, 567; 'terremare' settlements,
 568-571
 'Mediterranean' race-type, 22, 34 *sq.*, 564
sq., 596, 599 (*and n.*)
 Medusa, 478
 Megaliths, in Sardinia, 566; S. Italy, 567;
 Maltese Is., 576; Lampedusa, 582;
 Iberian peninsula, 587-590; the Algarve
 and Almeria, 588; France, 591 *sq.*;
 Britain, 594; megalith-builders, problem
 of, 597-601
 Megalopolis, 618
 Megara, 481, 534, 538; (Hyblaea), 565
megara, Mycenaean, 432, 450; at Melos, 450
 Megarid, the, 475, 544
 Megiddo (plan, 69), 55, 381 *sq.*; Thutmose
 III's expedition, 68, 297, 328 *sq.*, 426;
 attack of the Habiru, 124; Seti I, 135;
 in Amarna Letters, 313, 325, 349; in
 O.T., 386 *sq.*, 390, 396
 Melchizedek, 397
 Melicertes, 538; -Palaemon, 615
 Meli-shipak II, 244; god, 245
 Melitene, 255, 270 *sq.*, 272
 Melkarth, 538
 Melos, 437, 448 *sqq.*, 467, 482, 519, 537, 554
 Melukkhha, 142, 242, 304
 Memnon, 102, 500
 Memphis, local council, 46; temple, 49, 73;
 Amenhotep II at, 90; relief sculpture,
 103, 412; Seti I, 138; Ramses II, 140;
 foreign quarter, 154; Pthah, 162, 184;
 law-court at, 210; Syrians in temples, 328
 Menelaus, 22, 474, 477, 479, 485, 491, 497,
 500, 512, 539, 626 *sq.*
 Menestheus, 481
 Menidi tomb, 614
 Menkheperesen(e)b, 85, 279, 286
 Menocoeus, 620
 Mentuhotep, 410 (*and n.*)
 Merasar (Murshil), 137, 149
 Mercury, planet, 218
 Meribah, 361
 Merire, 115, 122, 321 *n.*
 Meritaton, 127
 Merneptah (*or* Merenptah, Menepthah;
 Hotep(hi(r)ma), 8, 151, 157, 172 *sq.*, 282,
 344, 356 *n.*, 357, 381; succession of, 165;
 Libyans repulsed by, 167 *sqq.*, 276, 320,
 475, 486, 581 *sq.*
 Merneptah-Siptah, 170 *sq.*
 Mērōm, 311
 Mērōz, 386
 Merycy, 166 *sq.*
 Mes, inscription of, 210, 214
 Mesha, of Moab, 394
 Meshech, the; *see* Mushkh(a)i
 Mesheneth, 141
 Meshesher, 175 *sq.*
 Meshwesh, the, 166, 175 *sq.*, 326, 581 *n.*;
see Mashauasha
 Mesopotamia, 3 *sq.*, 92 *n.*; growth of rela-
 tions with Egypt, 228; Hittite culture,
 252; 'Hattic' dialects, 253; 'Hattic'
 monuments, 255; Semitic records, 256;
 'Hattic' invasions, Babylonian references
 to, 257; M. influences in Syria, 330 *sq.*;
 Aramaean states in, 378
 Messapian language, 24 *sq.*
 Messe, 541 *n.*
 Messenia, 479, 483, 519 *n.*, 531-533, 536,
 540 *sq.*
 Messianic ideas, 483, 394 *sq.*
 Messina, 36
 Metella, 137; *see* Mutallu
 Methodius, 25
 Methone, 540 *sq.*
 Methymna, 495
 Metina, ? = Mitanni, 238
 Metis, 635
 Metrodorus, 608
 Michāl, 371
 Midas, 16
 Mideia, 457 *sq.*
 Midian, 298, 353, 362, 370, 382, 387, 392
 Migrations in Europe, Ch. II *passim*;
 Roman plantations, 26; Balkan move-
 ments, 164, 460, 465, 474; Levantine
 peoples, Ch. XII; Aramaeans, etc., 369;
 Dorians, Ch. XIX; Hellenic settlements in
 Asia Minor, Ch. XX
 Milan, 35
 Milcōm, 394, 404
 Mildish, 249
 Miletus, Ionians of, 18, 507, 543-562 (*passim*);
 Carians of, 492, 514, 552, 554 *sq.*; aite,
 542, 554; (Cretan), 482
 Milidia, 250; *see* Malatia

- Milyas, 9, 16
 Mimnermus, 541
 Min, god, 50, 348
 Minaeans, 362; date, 380
 Minoan = Gaza, 285, 288; other towns, 475
 Minoan culture, 277 *n.*, 280; periods—Late, I–III, 279, 287; Late I, 431–439; Late II, 439–441; Late III, 441–450; *see* 431 *n.*; Middle, 287; pottery, in Palestine, 294; influence upon Egyptian art, 420; vases, in Egypt, 426; art, Late I, 434 *sqq.*; pottery, Late I, 436; costume, Late I, 436; pictographic script, 437, 442; remains, in Anatolia, 553 *sq.*, 556 *sq.*
 — religion, 288
 Minoans, 277; = Keftians, 277–280, 286; dress, 286 *sq.*
 Minorca, 584
 Minoan, and Leleges, 10, 556; tradition of, 27 *sq.*, 278 *sq.*, 380, 437, 441, 475, 476, 482, 618
 Minotaur, the, 288; in art, 435; origin of legends, 462, 476
 Minyae (Orchomenus), 481; (Peloponnese), 539; (Asia Minor), 544, 552
 Minyans of Pagasae, 631
 Miriam, 363, 386
 Mishrifeh, 293
 Misir, 398
 Misri, 266; *see* Musri
 Mitanni, Aryan kingdom, 58, 228 *sq.*, 241, 259, 377, 382, 385; opposition to Thutmose II, 67, 300; T.'s campaigns, 74–77, 82; Amenhotep II, 89 *sq.*; Amenhotep III, 94 *sq.*, 106 *sqq.*; Ikhnaton, 121, 300 *sq.*, 306; civil war, 122 *sq.*, 237; Hittite alliance, 122 *sq.*, 238; collapse, 149; invasion of Assyria, 230; alliance with Egypt, 232 *sqq.*; Hittite (?) monuments, 255; language, 259; Hittite invasion, 261 *sq.*; alliance, 264, 319; M., in Amarna Letters, 297–302, 340; names, in Syria, 331; influence, at Jerusalem, 400
 Mit(h)ra, 13, 331, 400
 Mitrassil, 400; *see above*
 Mizpah, 369
 Mnaira, 576
 Mnevis bull, the, 206
 Moab, mountains, 55, 362; people, 296, 352, 365 *sq.*, 372, 382, 391, 393 *sq.*; language, 332 *sq.*
 Mochlos, 437
 Moesia, and Mysians, 12, 17, 487
 Moeso-Goths, 39
 Mohammed, 298
 Mohammedan ware in Palestine, 376
 Molfetta, Pulo di, 565
 Moloch (Mölech), 617
 Molpis, 620
 Monembasia, 475
 Monge, 588
 Monotheism in the ancient East, its meaning, 111, 197, 342; its origin in Egypt explained, 203 *sqq.*; tendencies in Palestine and Syria, 350; *see* Ikhnaton, Yahweh
 Moon-cults in Palestine, 350
 Mopsacrene, 547
 Mopsuestia, 547
 Mopsus, Moxus, 547, 552
 Moravian Gate, 21; 'Wiros,' 29; Slavs, 32
 Morbihan, 592
 Moschi, the; *see* Mushkh(a)
 Mose, 326 *n.*
 Moses, Ch. XIV (rise of Israel), 353–371 *passim*, 391 *n.*, 395, 402 *sq.*; the name, 355
 Mösul, 257
 Motya, 578
 'Mousterian' period, in Italy and Sicily, 563; in N. Africa, 579; in Spain, 585
 Mudros, 495
 Mugem, kitchen-middens, 586; mixed skull-types, 586
 Mukhrasht., 315; *see* Mareshah
 Mummification, and knowledge of anatomy, 219 *sq.*; coffin-decorations, 414 *sq.*
 Murattash, 250
 Murcia, palaeolithic cave-deposits, 586
 Murshilish (-ish, a case ending; Eg. Marusil[*e*]), 137, 149; I, 230, 260 *n.*; II, 227, 238–240, 302, 318, 335; his reign, 264
 Müsa, Jebel, 362
 Mushant, the, 281
 Mushkh(a), the (Meshech, Moschi), 247 *sq.*, 272, 274, 546
 Musri (Misri), 234, 241, 250, 320
 Mut, vulture-goddess, 116, 159, 215, 345
 Mutakkil-nusku, 247 *sq.*
 Mutallu (or Muwattalish), 137, 149, 240, 260 *n.*, 264, 318; war with Ramses II, 141 (and *n.*), 142 *sqq.*, 146; reign, 264 *sq.*
 Mutemuya, 92, 300
 Muzeirib, 312
 Mycale, 544, 554
 Mycalessos, 27
 Mycenae, Ch. XVI *passim*, 450–456; supremacy of, 456–468; scarabs of Amenhotep III and Tiy at, 97; Philistines and, 278, 287; Cretan (Late Minoan I) objects at, 437; shaft-graves at, 441, 443, 446, 450, 452–454; connection with Crete, 451 *sq.*; shaft-grave dynasty, 454; tholos-tomb dynasty, 454 *sqq.*; Lion Gate, 457, 471; extent of commerce, 459 *sq.*; shipping, food, houses, 462 *sq.*; writing, 463; export trade, 463; religious observances, 464; causes of decline, 465 *sq.*; cultural and linguistic *hoind*, 466 *sq.*; Agamemnon, 477 *sq.*, 479; extent of M. power, 482 *sq.*; Homeric poems and, 511, 513; M., fall of, 525; Dorians at,

- 533 *sq.*, 537; 'Caro-Lelegian' culture, 556 *sq.*; M. care for dead, 614
- Mycenaean ware, tribute to Egypt, 58; commerce with Egypt, 97; graves, in the Lebanon, 293; pottery, in Palestine, 293 *sq.*, 294 *n.*, 329; vases, in Egypt, 426; pottery, in Thessaly, 469; transition to Geometric style, 521; wares—in Sicily, 570, in Latium, 574
- Mylasa, 10, 552, 554, 558
- Myndus, 554
- Myrina, 552, 554
- Myrmidons, the, 481
- Mysia, 8; people, 10, 12, 141, 275, 281 *sq.*, 487 *sq.*, 492; Moesians, 17; Dardania, 17; Mysian tombs, 257, 555; *see* Masa
- Mysus, 10
- Nablus (Shechem), 330
- Nabonidus, 242
- Nabu-dayani, 243
- Nadab, 363
- Nagidos, 544, 559
- Nahar(a)in, 59, 233, 263; Thutmose III, 76, 82, 87, 89; T. IV, 91 *sq.*; Ramses II, 141, 148, 150, 154; N.=Mitanni, 299; Amarna Letters, 317; Seti I, 319
- Nāhāsh, 373
- Nahr el-'allān, 311
- Nahr el-Kelb, 250
- Na'iri, 242, 250
- Nakht, tomb of, 414
- Namar, 245
- Name, 342
- Namiawaza, 331, 338
- Napata, 90, 155
- Naphtali, 367, 370, 386
- Naples, 36
- Naptera, 267
- Narām-sin, 15
- Nasātyas (Nashatianna), the, 13, 400
- Naucratis, 560, 562
- Naupactus, 518, 532 *sq.*
- Nauplia, 537, 540
- Naval battle, earliest records, 174 *sq.*, 179; naval attacks on Egypt, 268
- navetas, naus*, 584
- Navigation, Egyptian, 178; Mycenaean, 462; *see* Sea-power
- Nawā, 312
- Nazareth, 313
- Nazarites, the, 388
- Naziba, 311
- Nazibugash, 235
- Nazi-maruttash II, 238 *sq.*, 240
- Neanderthal remains, 575, 586
- Neb-hapet-re, 410
- Nebi-mandib, 265
- Nebo, god, 350, 377
- Neb-re, votive stela of, 208
- Nebuchadrezzar I, 244, 246 *sq.*; wars, 247 *sq.*, 378
- Neferti-it, 412; *see* Nofretete
- Nefretete, 159
- Negroes, and Egyptian empire, 93 *sq.*
- Nehi, 85
- Nehsi, 61, 63, 66
- Neit, goddess, 580
- Neker, 347
- Nekhen, 53 *sq.*
- Nekhtamon, 208
- Neleus, kingdom of, 477, 479
- Nemesis, 625
- Neonteichos, 553
- Neoptolemus, 497, 500
- Nephilim, the, 367
- Nephtys, goddess, 201
- Nephthah, 344
- Nereus, 289
- Nestor, 460, 479, 492, 515, 540 *sq.*, 626
- Nesubenebbed, 191 *sq.*, 194, *cf.* 251
- 'Nether World, Book of the,' 51
- Neuchâtel, lake, 593
- New Grange (Ireland), 594, 597
- Nigimti, 238
- Nike, 604
- Nile, the, 10; valley, open to attack, 40; harvests, and the Pharaoh's income, 45; Hatshepsut's fleet, 62; canal to lakes of Suez, 136; first rise of, and calendar, 218; N. as deity, 346
- Nimrūd, 430
- Nineveh, 58, 108, 344, 430
- Nin-kal, 347
- Ninurta, 350
- Ninurta-nadin-shum, 246 *sq.*
- Ninurta-pal-ekur, 243 *sq.*
- Ninurta-tukulti-ashur, 246 *sq.*, 248
- Nippur, 234 *sq.*, 242 *sq.*, 244; temple, 245
- Nireus, 482
- Nirou Chani, 432
- Nisa, Nisaea, 481
- Nisyrus, 482
- Niy, Nia, 77, 89, 123, 262 *sq.*, 301, 308, 310, 323, 328
- Nofretete, 109; *see* Neferti-it
- Nordic race-type in Europe, 22, 38
- Nostoi*, the, 500
- Notium, 552, 559
- Novilara, 572
- Nubia, Nubians, and Ahmose, 40; Amen-hotep I, 51; Thutmose I, 54; Thutmose III, 76, 80, 85 *sq.*, 203; Amenhotep II, 90; Thutmose IV, 92; Amenhotep III, 93 *sq.*; N. in Egyptian army, 96, 155, 304; Aton-city, 114, 119, 128; gold-mines, 139 *sq.*, 195; Ramses II's levies, 142; R.'s buildings, 153; Siptah, 170; Ramses III, 177; Ramses XI, 191; *see* Kush
- Nuges, 141, 310, 326, 344; *see below*

Nukhashshi, 107, 123 *sq.*, 231, 262, 348, 377; in Amarna Letters, 301, 310
Numbers, Book of, 364
nuraghi, 566, 583 *sq.*
 Nut, goddess, 414
 Nymphs, pass, 270 *sq.*

O. See U.

Oasis region of Egypt, 78
 Oassians (Caria), 283 *n.*
 Oaxians (Crete), 283 *n.*
 Odessus, 556, 560
 Odysseus, 480, 484 *sq.*, 491, 499, 507, 627
Odyssey, the, and Crete, 9; Cimmerians, 16; subject-matter, 500; authorship, 506 *sq.*; problem of date, 507; Homeric religion, 626 *sq.*; see Homer
Oedipodeia, the, 501
 Oeta, Mt, 475, 481, 520, 526
 'Ög, 366 *sq.*
 el-'Olā, 362
 Olbia, 32
 Old Testament; see Bible
 Olenus, 480
 Olympia, 531, 628
 Olympian gods, 485, 515 *sq.*, 629-638
 Olympus, Mt, 526, 528, 530, 606, 625
 'Omri, 391
 Opet, feast of, 72, 183
 'Ophrah, 387
 Opis, 251
 Opūs, 480
 Oracles, 346, 485, 576; see Delphi, Dodona
 Oran, 579
 Orchomenus, 98, 454, 459, 475, 481, 621
 Ordasu, 273
 Ordovices, the, 31 *n.*
 Orestes, 496 *sq.*, 539, 628
 Oroanda, 141, 281 *sq.*, 488 *n.*
 Orontes river, 55-58, 74 *sq.*, 82 *sq.*, 123, 137, 141 *sq.*, 148, 165, 265
 Orpheus, 615, 620
 Orthia, temple of, 521
 Oscan dialect, 33; people, 36 *sq.*, 276
 Osiris, judge, 51, 201, 345; temple at Abydos, 59; and Aton, 126; prayer of Ramses IV, 158 *sq.*; O. democratized, 196, 201, 209; hymns to, 197
 Ossa, Mt, 526
 Ostrovo, lake, 530
 'Othniel, 367, 375, 385
 Othrys, 468 *sq.*, 530
 Otranto, 567
 Ovid, 621
 Oxylius, 518 (and *n.*), 531

P. The Semitic *p* becomes *f* in Arabic; *ph* or *f* is often used (the former in the O.T.) to represent the soft Hebrew *p*.

'P.' Babylonian Chronicle, 229 *n.*, 235 (and *n.*)
 P-peoples, 33 *sq.*, 36
 Pachyammos, 437
 Paconians, 17, 31, 492
 Pagasae, 18, 30, 469 *sq.*, 620
 Pakht, 65
 Palaeolithic culture, 21; Ice Age, 22; Spain, 585 *sq.*
 Palaikastro, 294, 432 *sq.*, 439, 443, 445 *sq.*, 615
 Palestine, 4; Hittites, 6 *sq.*; Egyptian empire, 55 *sq.*, 229, 326, 357; topography, 56; decay of Egyptian power in, 124 *sq.*, 169; Philistine civilization in, 289-295, 303; origin of name, 295; results of excavation in, 296; P. in Amarna Letters, 309-318; continuity of tradition, etc., in, 376; black-ware (pottery), 425; P. and Mycenae, 460; see Canaan, Syria
 Pali, 13 *n.*
Palladium, the, 635
 Palmyra, 298, 377
 Pamisos river, 540
 Pamphylia, 16, 284, 529 *n.*, 537, 547, 559 *sq.*; Greek dialect, 16; 'Caro-Lelegian' remains, 554
 Pamphylioi, 525, 527, 529 *n.*
 Pamphylus, 527
 Pan, 624
 Panari mountains, 249
Panathenaea, the, 641
 Pandora, 607, 611
 Pannonia, 26, 35
 Pantelleria, 581, 600
 Panticapaeum, 32, 560
 Panyassia, 542
 Paphlagonia, 12, 490; Paphlagonians, 14, 492
 Papyri: Abbott, 210 *sq.*; Amherst, 211; Anastasi I, 225, 326, 423 *n.*; Ani, 414; Berlin Medical, 219; Bologna 1094, 224; Ebers, 219 *sq.*, 330; Edwin Smith, 330 *n.*; Golenischeff, see Wenamon; Harris, 171, 182, 184, 222, 283 *n.*, 285; Kahun, 213, 216, 218; Leiden, 222; London, 219; Mayer A, 210 *sq.*; Moscow, 216, 218; Nebsteni, 414; d'Orbiney, 223; Raifet, 224; Rhind, 215, 218; Sallier I, 223; Sallier II, 222; Sallier III, 224; Smith, 220; various, 210 *sq.*, 215 *sq.*, 219, 223 *sq.*; illumination of, 414
 Papyrus, imported into Byblus, 193, 333
 Pārān, 364, 392
 Paris (of Troy), 487, 491, 500
 Par-khi, 300
 Parnassus, Mt, 30
 Parnon, 535
 Paros, 448, 450, 582
 Parthenius river, 17

- 'Pash' (*i.e.* Isin, Ishin) dynasty at Babylon, 244, 246
 Pasiphaë, 617
 Pastoral life of 'Wiros,' 29
 Patara, 552
patesi, 245
 Patroclus, 499 *sq.*, 505, 627
 Pausanias, 541 *n.*, 607
 Pay, 208
 Pedasus, 8, 27, 281, 488; *see* Pidasa
 Pedes; *see* Pidasa
 Peitho, 604
 Pelagones, the, 476
 Pelasgians, 8 *sq.*, 12, 26, 28, 473 *sq.*; distribution and name, 476; in Troad, 488, 490; and Dorians, 531; in Asia Minor, 544, 552 *sq.*; religion, 612 *sq.*
 Pelasgiotis, 476
 Peleset, 173 (*and n.*), 174, 191; *see* Philistines
 Pēlēthi, 285, 288
 Peleus, 18, 30, 481, 491, 500
 Pelishtī(m), 275, 284; *see* Philistines
 Pelopidas, 621
 Pelopids, hegemony of, 482 *sq.*, 486; in Asia Minor, 496; and Perseids, 497
 Peloponnese, Ionians of, 18; Dorians, 30, 518 *sq.*, 531; Slavs, 32 *sq.*; Mycenaean remains, 459; Myc. civilization, 467; Achaeans, 474, 477; Pelasgians, 476; Neleus, 477; Homeric Catalogue, 479 *sq.*
 Pelops, 477, 480, 482, 536, 618
 Pelos (?), 555
 Pelusium, 152
 Peña Tu, 587
 Penelope, 500
 Penestai, the, 10
 Peneus river (Peloponnese), 481; (Thessaly), 30, 480
Pentateuch, the, 356, 384
 Pentaur, Pentewere, Poem of, 156, 222 *sqq.*
 — (son of Tiy), 186 *sq.*
 Penthesilea, 500
 Pentheus, 620
 Penthilus, 496 *sq.*
 Penū'el, 383
 Peraebi, Perrhaebia, 481, 526 *n.*
 Percote, 490
 Perchu, of Punt, 62
 Perga, 559
 Pergamum, 4, 333; and Galatia, 19, 35
 Pergamus, of Troy, 490
 Per-hathor, 41
 Pericles, 641
periskoi, the, 538, 540
 Perire, 167
 Per-ramses, 152 *sq.*, 163, 178
 Peræid dynasty, 496 *sq.*
 Peræphone, 627, 636
 Peræus, legend of, 288, 478, 497; ruler of Mycenae, 476 *sq.*
 Persia, Alexander's route to, 3; Darius, 13; Lydia, 16; languages, 25; ethical tendencies, Persian and Semitic, 401; woods, imported into Egypt, 424; *see* Iranians
 Persian Gulf, 56
 Pessinus, 19
 Petisis, 295
 Peucini, 38
 Phaestus, 28, 432 *sq.*, 439–446 (*passim*), 482; disk, 278, 287, 294 *n.*; theatre, 290
 Pharaoh, the, 'owner' of Egypt, 41; income, 45 *sq.*; humanized, as emperor, 106 *sq.*; effect of Aton-worship, 120; powers menaced by priesthoods, 182–185; foreign 'butlers,' 185 *sqq.*; supremacy of priests, 190, 194 *sq.*; P. a god, 396
pharmakoi, 622
 Phaselis, 559
 Pheidon, 534
 Pherae (Thessaly), 481, 485
 Pherecydes, 552 *sq.*, 558
 Phidias, 408, 607, 642
 Philads, the, 628
 Philip II, of Macedonia, 26; V, 38; (of Theangela), 556
 Philistia, application of term, 379 (*and n.*); and Mycenae, 460, 464; *see below*
 Philistines, the, 173, 191 *sq.*, 376–381; in O.T., 275, 332, 371, 391 *sq.*; 'Peoples of the Sea,' 277 *sq.*; migration of, 283–288, 427; dress, 286 *sq.*; P. civilization in Canaan, 289–295, 303; Cretan cultural parallels, 290; language, 290; wars with Israel, 291 *sq.*, 383; pottery, 294 *n.*; P., evidence for origin of, 294 *sq.*; influence in Palestine, 376; fusion with Israelites, 382; P. oppression of Israel (O.T.), 388–391; *see* Pulesati, Purasati
 Philoetius, 625
 Phīneās, 355, 371
 Phlius, 533
 Phocaea, 552, 561
 Phocis, 459, 480, 544, 553
 Phoebus, 632
 Phoenice, = Caria, 27
 Phoenicians, in Egyptian art, 6; in Greek lands, 27; in Cyprus, 29; alphabet, 29 *sq.*; Kadesh, 57, 297; colonies, 57, 538, 581; Thutmose III, 74 *sq.*, 78; commerce with Egypt, 97, 178; coast in hands of Seti I, 137; loss of Egyptian power, 192 *sq.*, 237; 'Peoples of the Sea,' 278 *sq.*; 'Kēftiu' (*q.v.*), applied to P., 280; Egyptian naval power, 297; 'Afri,' 328; P. dialect, 332 *sq.*; Palestine, Phoenicia and the Philistines, 376–381; trading-centres, 379; name defined, 379 *sq.*; origin, 388; art, 428; Mycenae, 460; in Asia Minor (Greek tradition), 557; intercourse with Maltese Is., 578; trade with Britain (?), 598
phratra, 483

- Phrixus, 618, 620
 Phrygia, 10; Gauls in, 18 *sq.*, 35; Hittite culture, 252 *sq.*; monuments, 254 *sq.*; Gordium, 543; 'Caro-Lelegian' remains, 554 *sq.*
 Phrygians, 13 *sq.*, 284, 474, 487, 492; inscriptions, 13 *sq.*; supreme in Asia Minor, 15, 294; Midas, 16; language, 25; Thracio-Phrygian culture, 471
 Phthia, 474, 481 *sq.*, 491
 Phthiotis, 526
 Phylakopi, 448, 450, 554
phyle, 483
 Pianello, tombs at, 571
 Pianosa, 567
 Picts, the, 34
 Pidasa, 141, 281, 488; *see* Pedasus
 Piedmont, prehistoric, 567
 Pilaski, 239
 Pile-dwellings, 567 *sq.*; in France, 591; *see* Terremare
 Pindar, 519, 526 *n.*, 527 (*and n.*), 529, 531 *sq.*, 534, 538 *sq.*
 Pindus (range), 26, 481, 528, 530 *sq.*; (town), 526, 527 *nn*
 Piracy, in Aegean, 475; basis of Achaean power, 486
 Pisa, 477, 480
 Pisidia, 8, 282; people, 16, 281, 284, 304; tombs, 257, 554
 Pisistratus, 502 *sq.*, 633, 641
 Pitane, 496
 Pithôm, 152, 154, 320, 357
 Pityea, 490
 Plataea, 480
 Plato, 618, 626, 642
 Pleuron, 480
 Pliny, 5, 11
 Pluto, 636
 Po river, 20; Gauls in valley, 24, 35; Adriatic culture, 530; neolithic pottery, 565
 'Portals, Book of the,' 51 *sq.*
 Portugal, prehistoric drawings, 21
 Poseidon, 289, 496, 516, 552, 616, 622 *sq.*, 629, 631, 635
 — Heliconius, 631; Pater, Phratrion, 631
 Potiphar's wife, Joseph and, 223
 Potniae, 620
 Pottery, of Egypt and Near East, 415-426; neolithic, Italy and Sicily, 563 *sqq.*; *see* Art
 Praesus, 28, 289
 Pre-history of Europe, 21; Western Mediterranean, Ch. xxi
 Priam, 4, 17 *sq.*, 27, 30, 487 *sq.*, 491 *sqq.*, 511 *sq.*; in the *Iliad*, 500
 Priene, 552
 Priesthood, professional, in Egypt, 49; opposition to Ikhnaton, 126 *sq.*; p. and the State, 157 *sq.*; Amon's high-priest, 157 *sq.*; p., Achaean and Homeric, 485
 Pripet marshes, 32
 Proetus, 476, 497
 Propontia, 490, 493, 544, 547, 560
 Prosymna, 604
 Prussian, old, dialect, 25, 33
 Psaira, 432, 435, 437
 Ptah, 73, 142, 162, 178, 181, 184, 208, 345
 Ptah-hotep, Proverbs of, 221 *sq.*
 Ptolemaic Age, and the Keftiu, etc., 278 *sqq.*, 285
 Ptolemais, 302, 376
 Pudukhipa, 267, 271, 319
 Puemre, 78
 Puenet; *see* Punt
 Puente Mocho, 'Chellean' implements at, 585
 Pulesati, the, 173 *n.*, 268, 275, 283 *sq.*, 292, 295, 320; *see* Philistines
 Punt (Puenet), home of (Egyptian) gods, 62 *sq.*; riches of, 78; commerce, 178; Hatshepsut's expedition to, 62 *sq.*, 409, 410 *n.*
 Purasati, 275, 283, 295 (*and n.*); *see* Philistines
 Purukuzzi (Purukhumzi), 241 *sq.*, 247 *sqq.*
 Puzur-ashur IV, 232
 Pydna, 528
 Pylaemenes, 14
 Pylus (Messenia), 455, 480, 532, 536; (Kakovatos), 479, 482 *sq.*, 492, 540, 541 (*and n.*)
 Pyramid Texts, 43 *n.*, 222; the Sun-god, 112; and 'Book of the Dead,' 197 *sq.*, 200
 Pyramids, abandoned as tombs, 64; mensuration of, 215, 218; temple of Sahure, 276
 Pyramus river, 4, 547
 Pyrenees, the, 20, 23
 Pyrrhus, 538
 Pytho, 480
 Python, 611, 633
- Q. *q* is employed in some systems to represent the emphatic *ḳ* (𐤀, 𐤁), the Phoenician (or North Semitic) form of which is its ancestor.
- Q-peoples, 33 *sq.*, 36 *sq.*
 Quadi, the, 39
 Quintilian, 607
 Quiver, in Egypt, 43 (*and n.*)
- R. For *r* in Egyptian *see* on L.
- Ra'amset (town), 154, 357
rabiš, 322, 324 *sq.*
rabu, 322
 Rab-zidki, 309, 335
 Râchel, 368, 390
 Ramah, 375

Ramesseum, the, 147, 150, 152 sq., 155

Ramman, 348

Ramses (town); *see* Ra'amisēs

Ramses (Menpehtire) I, 135, 149

— (Usermare' Setepnere) II, 7 sq., Ch. VII (predecessors, 131–139; wars and foreign relations, 139–151; civilization of age, 151–163), 172, 178, 191, 194, 209, 223, 292, 342 sq., 346, 356 n., 357; succession, 139; war with Hittites, 141–148, 265, 281; Hittite alliance, 149 sqq., 240, 260 n., 262, 265 sqq., 272, 274, 330, 347; buildings, 151 sqq., 410, 413; = O.T. 'Pharaoh,' 154, 356 n.; Turin statue, 161, 163; personality, 161 sq.; harem conspiracy, 162 sqq., 210, 212; portrait of, 412

— Siptah; *see* Siptah

— (Hikōn) III, 158, 193 sq., 267, 277 sq., 320 sq., 341, 343, 346, 351, 357; record (in Papyrus Harris), 171; succession, 172; reign, 172–188; defensive campaigns, 172–177, 191, 275, 283 (and n.), 547, 581 n., 582; commerce, 178; buildings, 178 sqq., 413, 417; decline of Egypt, 378; intercourse with Minoan world, 447

— IV, 158, 188 sq., 321

— V, VI, 189, 218

— IX, 189, 191 sq., 210, 218

— X, 191, 194

— XI, 191 sq., 194 sq., 209, 224, 321

Ramsesnakht, 189

Raphia, 327

Rapiku, 241, 251

Rās el-'Ain, 255

Rawlinson, Sir H., and cuneiform script, 25

Rē', 142, 178, 181, 197, 206, 341, 346, 399; identified with Aton, 111; property in Egypt, 183; = Horus, 203 sq.

Rebekah, 359

Rebu, the, 166; *see* Libyans

Rechabites, the, 364

Red Sea, canal to Delta, 62, 88, 97, 136, 178; gold, 138; Merneptah, 170; the 'Exodus,' 353, 361, 384

'Reeds, Sea of,' 361

Rehōb, 326

Rehoboām (Rēhab'ām), 387

Rekhmire, 45, 80, 86, 210, 278, 286, 414, 438

Remedello, 566

Rephā'im, the, 367; valley of, 373

Resheph, 159, 347 sq., 396

Restan, 255

Retenu, = Syria, 148, 224, 327

Reūbēn, 366–369, 390

Rhadamanthys, 474

Rhea (Cybele), 611

Rhesus, 499, 504

rhetai, 483

Rhodes, Phoenicians at, 57; commerce with Egypt, 97, 426; Crete, 438; Mycenae, 464, 467; Homeric Catalogue, 482; Trojan War, 493; Geometric pottery, 522; Dorians, 528 sq., 537; traditional settlers, 552, 557; colonies, 561

Rhodope, Mt, 31

Rhyndacus river, 561

Rhytium, 482

Rīa, god, 248

Rib-Addi, 107 sq., 123 sq., 128; in Amarna Letters, 303–347 (*passim*)

Riblah, 142, 145 (on plan, for -eh)

Riesengebirge, 21

Rimisharma (or Rimisharri), 264

Rimmōn, 349

rita (Sansk.), 331, 400 sq.

Rock-painting, palaeolithic, 585 sq.; neolithic and later, 586 sq.

Rollright, stone circles at, 594

Romanelli (Grotta), 563

Romans in Asia Minor, 19; R.. origin of, 36

Rome, plundered by Gauls, 35

Rubute, 315

Rukhizzi, 263, 312

Ruku (Luka); *see* Lycians

Rusmanya, 331

Russia, 20 sq.

S. *ś* represents the hard Semitic sibilant (ص, ض; for the sonant stop ض *see* D). For *š* (ش, ש) is here used *śh*, although this could also represent *s* + *h*. The clumsy doubling of *śh* (e.g. Kashsh-šes) is sometimes ignored, or is replaced by *śśh*. In Egyptian *s* tends to be confused with *z*; and in Bab. and Ass. the interchanges of *s*, *śh* and also *z* are exceedingly confusing.

Sabines, the, 36

Sack of Ilios, the, 500 sq.

es-Šāfi, Tell, 293 sq.

Sagalassus, 8, 167, 282, 284, 304; name-suffix, 16, 282; *see* Shakaleša

*Sa.Gaz*¹, 299, 304, 311–319 (*passim*), 324, 338, 348, 356, 381 (and n.), 400

Sag-mudammik-sharbe, 246

Sahara, 'Capsian' culture in, 579 sq.

Sahure', 276

¹ The people whose name is represented by the ideograms *Sa* and *Gaz* (also written *Sa.Ga.Ax* and *Gaz* alone) are evidently identical with the Ḥabiru (q.v.); the syllables probably represent *habbatum*, 'robber'; *see* Burney, *Judges*, pp. lxxv sqq.; Dhorme, *Rev. Bib.* 1924, pp. 12 sqq.

- Saïs, 580
 Saïte (artistic) revival, 411 *sq.*
 Sâjûr river, 263
 S'akere (Smenkhkhere), 127 *sq.*
 Sakjegözü, 430
 Saladin, 81
 Salaman, Redcliffe, 382
 Salamis (Attic), 481, 492, 522 *sq.*; (Cyprus), 333
 Sallustius, 609
 Salmydessus, 556
 Sam'al, 262
 Samaria, Samaritans, 333, 355
 Samlah, 393 (*and n.*)
 Samos (Asia Minor), 544 *sq.*, 552 *sq.*, 559, 561, 631; colonies, 561; (Cephalonia), 480
 Samosata, 255
 Samson, 290, 338, 354, 370, 388
 Samsun (Amisus), 2, 4 *sq.*, 14
 Samuel (*Shēmū'el*), 291, 354, 371, 388 *sq.*, 392, 393 *n.*
 Sandahannah, Tell, 333
 Sangara, 280, 386
 Sangarius river, 4, 254, 492
 San Isidro, 'Chellean' implements, 585
 Sanskrit, 13 *n.*, 25; *cf.* 331
 Saradaush, 250
 Sarah, 384
 Saraush, 250
 Sardes, excavation of, 2, 11, 543, 558; Cyrus, 3; Hermus valley, 4; 'Shardina', 8, 282, 287; 'Sherden', 96; monuments, 254; Zeus, 615
 Sardinia, 8, 581-584, 599, 600; 'Sherden', 96; 'Shardina', 276, 282; Copper Age in, 566 *sq.*; round stone huts, 578
 Sardo, 287
 Sardus, 583
 Sargon I, 6, 228, 324, 546, 559
 Sarmatians, the, 32
 Saronic Gulf, 481, 536
 Sarpedon, 493 *n.*
 Sarupi, 249
 Sarus river, 4, 272
 Sassari, 600
 Saturn, planet, 218
 Sâul (*Shâ'ul*), 291, 354, 383, 406 *n.*; his reign (O.T.), 371-393 *passim*
 Savoy, 591
 Scamander river, 4, 487, 489 *sq.*, 626
 Scandinavian peninsula, 21; Germanic races, 38; languages, 39
 Scarab (aeus), origin of, 51; Amenhotep III, 95, 97, 105 *sq.*
 Scarab, Egyptian, 415 *sq.*
 Sciron, 620
 Scordisci, the, 26, 35
 Scotland, 21; types of stone circle in, 595
 Sculpture of Egypt and Near East, historical development, 407-415
 Scylax river, 4
 Scyryus, 18
 Scythians, 17, 32
 'Sea; Isles of the,' 430
 'Sea, Peoples of the,' 275-283, 295, 303; identification, 276; not Semitic, 278 *sq.*, 290
 Sea-power, 280, 297, 302; *see* Navigation
 Sebek, god, 345
 Sebekemsaf, 190
 Sebekhetep, tomb of, 414
 Sebenneh-su relief, 250
 Šédek, 398
 Sefinet Nûh, 293
 Seihun, 4
 Seine river, 34
 Sê'ir, 177, 317, 321, 366, 390
 Sekenenre, 223
 Selene, 609
 Sellasia, 535
 Selloi, the, 626
 Semites, in Egyptian art, 413 *sq.*; costume of, 420
 Semitic population of Syria, 56; culture and commerce, 57 *sq.*; slaves, in Egypt, 98 *sq.*; S. loan-words in Egyptian, 154, 328, 332 *sq.*; S. officials of the Pharaohs, 154 *sq.*; S. language of Babylonia, 229; Mesopotamian records, 256; influence in Capadocia, 258; 'Peoples of the Sea,' not S., 278 *sq.*; S. language, in Philistia, 289, 332 *sq.*; Dagon, 289; alphabets, North and South, 333 *sq.*; continuity of S. influences in Palestine, 376; ethical tendencies, Persian and S., 401; emphasis on personality, 402; S. influence in western Asia Minor, 557; *see* Habiru, Israel, Phoenicians
 Semneh, 85
 Send (Senedi), 219
 Sengara, 232
 Senmen, 61
 Sennacherib, 238, 251, 345, 547
 Sennemut, 61, 63, 65 *sq.*, 279, 286, 409 *sq.*, 414
 Senones, the, 35
 Senuret I, 189, 343; III, 411; *see* Sesostri
 Senzar, 76, 89; Sezar, 310; *cf.* Zinzar
 Seplel, 122, 136, 149; *see* Shubbiluliuma
 Septuagint, the, 287
 Sequana river, 34
 Sequani, the, 34
 Serabit el-Khâdim, 333, 345, 362
 Serapis (Osiris), 209
 Serapna, 538, 539 *n.*
 Serbâl, Jebel, 362
 Serbia, 530
 Serbonian marshes, 283
 Sergi's theory of a 'Mediterranean' race, 564 *sq.*, 596, 599
 Serra das Mutelas, 588

- Serra Ilizi, 583
 Sesostri II, 191; III, 85; *see* Senusret
 Sestus, 490 *sq.*
 Set, god, 159, 348 *sq.*; *see* Sutekh
 Seth; *see* Sheth
 Seti (Menma're') I, 135, 177, 180, 194, 312, 321, 329, 344 *sq.*, 358; restoration of empire, 135 *sqq.*, 148, 264, 318 *sq.*; and of temples, 138; temple at Abydos, 154, 410; portraiture of, 412; reliefs, 413
 — II (Merneptah), 171 *sq.*, 522, 524 *n.*
 Setnakht, 172, 180
 Shabtuna, 142 *sq.*, 146
 Shadi-Teshub, 249
 Shagarakti-shuriash, 242 *sq.*
 Shahr, 272
 Shakalsha, the, 8, 268, 276, 281-285, = Shekelesh, 167, 173 *sq.*, = Shekhlal, 278, 281, 304; not Minoans, 286; *see* Sagarassus
 Shala, 251
 Shälēm, 396 *sq.*; ? god, 402
 Shalman, god, 396
 Shalmanser I, 149, 240 *sq.*, 259, 266 *sq.*, 273, 320
 Shalmiati, 396
 Shamash (Sun-god), 340 *sq.*, 347, 351, 377, 400
 Shamgar, 354, 386
 Shammar, the, 235
 Shamshi-adad, 241, 351; III, 258
 Shardina, the, 8, 275 *sq.*, 281-283, 291 *sq.*, 582; not Minoans, 286 *sq.*; *see* Sherden
 Shārōn, 325, 380
 Sharru-kin, 232
 Sharrupshi, 262, 301, 310
 Shārūhen, 67
 Shashkim, 311
 Shasu, the, 319-321, 326 *sq.*, 357
 Shatts, the, 581
 Shattuara, 241, 320
shauabti; *see* *ushabti*
 Shaul, 393
 S(h)ausshatar, 230, 238, 241, 300, 311 *n.*
 Shavaha, 334
 Sheba, the Queen of, 397
 Shechem (Nablus), 312, 326, 340, 344; in O.T., *see* Ch. XIV *passim*
 Shekelesh; *see* Shakalsha
 Shekhlal; *see* Shakalsha
 Shemesh-edom, 89, 347
Shephelah, the, 284, 314, 427
 Sherden, 96, 142, 155, 167, 172 *sqq.*, 177, 179, 304 *sqq.*, 321, 326; *see* Shardina
 Sherishe, 249
 Sheshonk (Shishak), 333
 Sheth (? = Sutu), 369
 sh-Shihab, Tell, 312, 319, 345
 Shilhak-In-Shushinak, 247
 Shlōh, 360 *n.*, 371, 390
 Shōbi, 373 *n.*
 Shubāri, the, 234, 242, 249
 Shubartu, 237
 Shubbiluliuma (-ma an affix? Eg. Sapa-lel[*e*] or Sapelul[u]), 122, 136, 149, 237 *sq.*, 256, 267, 269, 272 *sq.*, 299, 309 *sq.*, 318 *sq.*, 350, 400; date, 260 (*and n.*); his conquests, 260-264; 300 *sqq.*, 308; art, 270
 Shukamuna, 245
 Shumalia, 245
 Shumer, 242
 Shunashshura, 264, 273, 318, 335
 Shūnēm, 313
 Shūr, 359, 361, 368
 Shutata(r)ra, 241, 263, 301 *sq.*
 Shutatna, 313, 332
 Shutruk-Nakhkhunte, 244
 Shuttarna, 94 *sq.*, 234, 237, 241, 300 *sq.*, 311, 320, 346
 Shuwardata, 315 *sq.*, 324, 331, 341
 Shuzigash, 235
 Siberian conditions in N. Europe, 21 *sq.*
 Sicani, the, 24
 Sicily; *see* Ch. XXI (563-574, 600); 9; Sicani, 24; Minos, 28, 475; Oscan inscriptions, 36; 'Shakalsha,' 276; Mycenae, 459, 464; Minoa, 475; Greek colonies, 561; Copper Age (prehistoric), 566 *sq.*; Mycenaean (Late Minoan III) wares in, 570; Early Iron Age in, 572
 Siculi, the, language of, 24; race, 276
 Sicyon, 467, 477 *n.*, 478 *sq.*, 531, 533 *sq.*
 Side, 5, 559
 Sideni, the, 5
 Sidenum river, 5
Sideros, origin of, 5
 Şidōn, 58, 108, 136, 250, 305 *sq.*, 326, 378, 486; date of foundation, 379
 Şihōn, 366
 Sikels, ? = Shakalsha, 9, 276, 282; and Romans, 36 *sq.*; ? = Shekelesh, 167; ? = Thekel, 173; Homer, 507
 Silsileh, 112
Silver, origin of word, 5; value of, in Egypt, 98
 Simeon (Shim'ōn), 359 *sq.*, 365, 367 *sq.*, 370
 Simois river, 4, 489
 Simyra, harbour, 57, 75 *sq.*; city, 123, 237, 250; Amarna Letters (Şumur), 302 *sqq.*, 305, 312, 319, 323 *sq.*, 326
 Sin, moon-god, 377
 Sin, = Sinai, 350, 377
 Sinai, 55, 65, 228, 296, 321, 345, 377; copper in, 178; writings, 333; in O.T. narrative, 343, 353, 361, 364, 391 *n.*; S., identification of, 361 *sq.*
 Sinda, 16
 Sinis, 620
 Sinjar hills, 232
 Sinope, 2, 258, 561
 Sinties, the, 494

- Sinuhe, 110, 221, 222 *sq.*, 228, 296, 310, 325, 385
 Sippar, 235, 242, 244, 251
 Siptah, 170 *sqq.*
 Sipylus, Mt, 4, 548, 559
 Siret's discoveries at El Argar, etc., 590
 Sirius, and Egyptian calendar, 47, 218
 Sibera, 354, 375, 386 *sq.*
 Sisypheus, 478
 Siūt (Asyūt), 44, 213
 Siyankuk, 242 *n.*
 Skolot-Scythians, 17
 Slavonic languages, 25
 Slavs, 32
 Smyrna, 4, 254, 501, 509 *sq.*, 519 *n.*, 548 *sq.*, 552, 554
 Socrates, 606, 642
sōkēn (*zūkin*), 322
 Solar theology of Egypt, 50 *sqq.*
 Soleb, 85, 92 *n.*, 129
 Soli (Cilicia), 559
 Solomon (Shēlōmōh), 345, 354, 371, 380;
 his trade, 97; in O.T., 384, 387, 392,
 394-397; the name, 395 (*and n.*), 397
Solomon, Song of, 226
 'Solutrean' remains, in N. Africa, 579
 Solygeum, 530, 534
 Solymi, the, 9, 16
 Soisipolis, goddess, 615
 Sothis, and Egyptian calendar, 218; *see*
 Sirius
 Spain, prehistoric drawings, 21; Visigoths,
 23; Gauls, 34 *sq.*; Mycenae, 459
 Sparta, 467, 479, 483, 502; Ch. XIX, the
 Dorians (Sparta, 538-541); 521, 523,
 530, 532 *sq.*, 535
 Spells, in the 'Book of the Dead,' 197-200
 Spercheus river, 474-476, 481, 523 *sq.*
 Sphacteria, 480
 Sphinx, Lydian and Etruscan, 11; of
 Gizeh, 91
 Stanton Drew, stone circles, 594
 Stasinus, 501
 Steel from Asia Minor, 5
 Stentinello, 565
 Stenyclarus, 540 *sq.*
 Steppes of Russia, 20
 Sthenelus, 477, 497; S. II, 479
 Stone Age, the, and 'Wiros,' 29
 Stonehenge, 594 *sq.*
 Strabo, 2, 5, 14, 16, 541 *n.*, 552, 556;
 Carians, 19; 'Valley of Kings,' 64
 Stratonicea, 554
 Strymon river, 476
 Sūdi, 241
 Suduk, 398
 Suez caravans, 97; 'Bitter Lakes,' canal to
 Nile, 136; forts, 153; commerce, 154
 Suez Canal, defence of, 40
 Sugagi, 237
 Sukhi, 251
 Sumerian language, 254; art, 428 *sq.*
 Sun, temple of, at Sippar, 235
 Sun-god of Egypt, 73, 399; conception
 modified by imperial expansion, 110 *sq.*,
 119, 203 *sq.*, *see* Ikhnaton; Re and Aton,
 111; symbol of, 111 *sq.*; Ramses III,
 181; Re-Horus-Amon, 203 *sq.*; in Amarna
 Letters, 340 *sqq.*, 350; and names, 331;
 see Helios
 Sun-goddess, traces of a, 350
 Surgery, Egyptian, 218
 Suri, 306
 Susa, 237, 242 *sq.*, 430
 Sutekh, god, 142, 149, 151, 159, 179, 348
sq.; *see* Set
 Sutū, Suti, bedouin, 234 *sq.*, 238, 263, 299,
 348, 369, 381, 405; in Amarna Letters,
 309, 311, 314; *see* Sheth
 Switzerland, pile-dwellings, 568; 'La Tène'
 culture, 593
 Syme, 482
 Symplegades, the, 18
 Synchronous History (Babylonian), 229 *n.*,
 235 *n.*, 244, 251
 Syria, 3 *sq.*; western, and Hittites, 7; and
 Egyptian empire, 54 *sq.*, 203; topo-
 graphy, 55 *sq.*; S., a 'bridge,' 56; culture,
 57; revolt against Thutmose III, 67;
 reduction by Th., 67-78; S., wealth of,
 71 *sq.*; harbours, 78; Amenhotep III,
 88 *sq.*; Aton-city, 114, 119, 399; revolt
 against Ikhnaton, 122 *sqq.*; decay of
 Egyptian power in, 123 *sq.*; Seti I's
 partial reconquest, 135 *sq.*; S. officials of
 the Pharaohs, 154 *sq.*; S. invaded from
 the north, 174; Egyptian temple-
 property in, 182; collapse of Egyptian
 power in, 192 *sqq.*, 299; cuneiform
 writing, 228; Hittites, 240; H. culture
 of N. Syria, 252 *sq.*; H. monuments, 255,
 271; rise of Hatti dynasty, 260-269;
 excavation in, 296; Syrian prisoners in
 Egypt, 328; beginning of Iron Age in,
 378; art, 426-430; *see* Philistines; *see*
 also Ch. XIII (the Amarna Age—Hatti
 and Mitanni, 297-302; Phoenicia and
 Amor in Amarna Letters, 302-309; the
 Lebanons and Palestine, 309-318; sub-
 sequent events, 318-321; relations with
 Egypt, 321-330; language and writing,
 330-336; style and ideas, 336-345;
 deities, 345-351); *see* Canaan, Palestine
 Syrtis, Lesser, 581

T. The hard Semitic *t* is represented by *t* (𐤏, 𐤐). *th* represents the ordinary aspirated *t* (in some systems *th*), although this might also stand for *t* + *h*.

Tā'anach, 68, 70, 313, 323, 331, 333 *sq.*, 346, 349, 381, 386 *sq.*

- Tabal, 272
 Tabor, 148, 319
 Tacitus, and German tribes, 38; Jews and Philistines, 285 (*and n.*)
 Tadmör, 250
 Tadukhipa, 95, 234, 300
 Taenärüm, 541
 Tagi, 310 *n.*, 312, 315-317, 338 *n.*
 Tahash (Takhsh, Takhshi, Tikhsi), 89 *sq.*, 311, 326
 Takib-sharri, 301
 Takkiru canal, 248
 Takompso, 182
 Taku, 310 (*and n.*), 322; *cf.* Tagi
 Takuwa, 262, 301, 310; *cf.* Tagi
 Talavera de la Reina, 589
talayots, 584
 Tal Herba, 575
 Talmüd, the, 385
 Tammüz, 347 *sq.*, 394, *n.* 2
 Tanais river, 556
 Tangur, 54 *sq.*
 Tan Hill (Wilts.), 597
 Tanis, 151 *sqq.*, 191, 358
 Tantalid tombs, 548
 Taranto, 530, 570, 572
 Tardenoisian culture, 586
targ, 331
targamannu, 335
 Tark(h)(un), god, 271, 273, 331
 Tarkhundarabaush, 234, 272, 312, 332
 Tarshish, 590
 Tarsus, 2 *sq.*, 15, 546 *sq.*, 559
 Tartarus, 606
 Tatra, the, 21, 26
 Taueret, 424
 Taurisci, the, 26
 Taurus, Mt, 2, 15, 230, 259, 271 *sq.*, 492 *n.*
 Tausret; *see* Tewoaret
 Taygetus, 520, 539, 541 (*and n.*)
 Tebah, 326
 Tébéssa, 581
 Tectamus, 528
 Tectosages, the, 18, 35
 Tehenu, Tehennu (Libyans), 166, 169, 280
 Teitte, 310, 348
 Telchines, the, 544, 552
Telegonia, the, 500, 501
 Telegonus, 500
 Telemachus, 626
 Telesilla, 534
 Telestes, 534
 Telmissus, 554
 Temeh (= Libya), 173, 176
 Temenus, 497, 518, 532-534
 Tempe, vale of, 30, 633
 Temple, at Jerusalem, 396
 Temples, evolution of Egyptian, 100 *sq.*; property, Chs. III-VIII *passim*, 182-185; Philistine temples, 289; restoration of, in Egypt, 409 *sq.*
 Tenedos, 491, 496, 620, 622
 Tenos, 633
 Tenu, 327
 Teos, 552; colony, 561
 Teresh, the, 167; *see* Tursha
 Termera, 554
 Termessos, 16
 Termilai (Trmml), the, 9, 282, 492
 'Terremare' settlements, 523, 530, 568-571; cremation, 567 *n.*, 574
 Teshub, god, 7, 95, 300, 332, 340, 401
 Teucrians, the, 491
 Teutones, the, 38
 Teutonic and Achæan (Homeric) poetry compared, 511 *sqq.*
 Teutonic languages, 25
 Tewosret (Tausret), 171 *sq.*
 Texier's explorations in Asia Minor, 2
 Thales, 557
 Thames, in Ice Age, 21
Thargelia, the, 622 *sq.*
 Tharu, 67, 72, 133, 135 *sq.*, 153
 Theangela, Philip of, 10, 556
 Theatre 'areas' of Philistines and Cretans, 290
Thebaid, the, 501
 Thebe (Asia Minor), 488
 Thebes (Boeotia), 27, 451, 454, 459 *sq.*, 463, 486, 526 *n.*; in epic, 501
 Thebes (Egypt), 41; tomb-biographies, 42; southern vizier at, 44-48; local 'council,' 46; temple of Amon, 49, 59; funeral furnishers, 52; Amenhotep I, 54; Thutmose I, 55; Phoenician traders, 57, 280; Hatshepsut's temple, 62; Thutmose III's enlargement of temple, 73 *sq.* (*see* Karnak); commerce, 79 *sq.*; wealth, 98; T. rebuilt by Amenhotep III, 101 *sq.*; Ikhnaton's religious revolution, 112 *sqq.*; court restored, 128; anarchy, 130; Harmhab and Seti I, 131-139; buildings of Ramses II, 152 *sq.*; Ramses III's buildings, 178 *sqq.*; T. cut off from sea, 191; memorial stelæ, 208; law-court, 210; Syrians in temples, 328; Anath, 347; tomb-paintings, 414; jewellery, 416
 Thêbêz, 388
 Thekel, 173 (*and n.*), 174, 191 *sq.*, 194, 320 *sq.*, 380; *see* Zakkai
 Thel, 153
 Themis, 400, 604, 611
 Themistocles, 621
 Theodosius, 126
 Theopompus, 535, 541
 Thera, 437, 448, 450, 467, 482, 537
 Therapne, 479, 538 *sq.*
 Thermaic Gulf, 528
 Thermopylae, 553
 Thermum, 480
 Theseus, 30, 443, 476, 478, 620, 629
 Thespiæ, 480

- Thessaly, 10; Dorians, 30, 518; T., wealth of, 30; *see* Ch. XVI, 468-472; 451, 455, 459 *sq.*, 467; Bronze Age in, 467 *sq.*; Mycenaean influence in, 470; Macedonia and north, 474; principalities of, 481; dialect, 509, 519; iron, 524; Homer, 529; Dorian invasion, 531; colonists to Asia Minor, 544
- Thetis, 498 *sqq.*
- Thinis (Abydos), 78, 84
- Thisbe, 454, 457, 459, 480
- Thoas, 494 *sq.*
- tholai*, Aegean, 583
- Thompson, R. Campbell, Kassite chronology, 696 *sqq.*
- Thoricus, 455
- Thoth, 86, 201, 399
- Thrace, Pelasgians in, 8; Indo-Europeans, 12; Asia Minor, 17; Carpathians, 20; Celts in, 35; Bryges, 284; Mycenae, 460; Troy, 490
- Thracian dialects, and old Albanian, 25; Thracians at Eleusis, 28; Greek civilization and worship, 31
- Thracio-Phrygian culture, 471
- Thronium, 480
- Thucydides, 9, 27, 519, 521, 527 *n.*, 530-532, 537, 540 (*and n.*), 556
- Thurii, 610
- Thut, god, 355
- Thutui, 61, 63, 65 *sq.*, 78, 84 *sq.*, 88
- Thutmose, Thutmases ('Okheperkere') I, 54 *sq.*, 59 *sq.* (*see* 326), 64, 75, 77, 229 *sq.*, 297
- ('Okheperne') II, 60 (*and n.*), 63
- Thutmose (Menkheperre') III, reign of, Ch. IV (consolidation of Egyptian empire, 67-78; Th.'s empire, 78-87); *see also* 107, 109 *sq.*, 128, 133, 135 *sq.*, 158, 162, 183 *sq.*, 231, 277, 279 *sq.*, 310, 328 *sq.*, 343, 356 *n.*; Th. and the Kheta (Hittites), 7, 257 *sq.*, 300; at Kadesh, 57; origin, 60, 112, 209; tomb, 64; reduction of Syria, 67-78, 231 *sq.*, 297 *sq.*; strategy, 74 *sq.*; in Euphrates valley, 76 *sqq.*; fleet, 80; 'conqueror of Hyksos,' 83; death, 86; Th.'s reign an epoch, 86 *sq.*, 110; Victory hymn, 222, 224; capture of Joppa, 223; architecture, 410 *sq.*
- (Menkheperure') IV, 91 *sqq.*, 232 *sq.*, 300; sculptured chariot, 104; tomb, 423
- Thyestes, 618
- Thynoi, the, 17
- Thyrea, 540
- Tibal, 272
- Tiber, 24
- Tibhath, 311
- Tibneh, 369
- Ticinus river, 35
- Tid'al, 267, 385
- Tienni, 324
- Tiglath-pileser I, 194, 237, 239, 241, 247; his reign, 248-251, 263
- Tigris, 228, 237
- Tikhsi; *see* Tahash
- Til-Barsip, 255
- Timaeus, 583
- Timmari, 530, 570-572
- Timnath, 326
- Timnath-heres, 369
- Timsah, lake, 153
- Tiryas, 450 *sq.*, 454, 458 *sq.*, 460 *sq.*, 463, 465, 476 *sq.*, 524 *sq.*, 529, 537, 614
- Tisamenus, 496 *sq.*
- Tishpak, 245
- Titans, the, 606, 615
- Tiy, 234, 309; scarabs of, 97; Theban quarter, 105; her significance, 106 *sq.*; influence on Ikhnaton, 109; Amarna-temple, 115; influence abroad, 121, 300 *sq.*, 318, 337; tomb, 127
- a queen of Ramses III, 186 *sq.*
- Tlepolemus, 482, 493 *n.*, 528 *sq.*
- Tmolus, 11
- Töb, 311
- Tocharish language, 25; Celtic and Italic, 33; (?) Celtic origin of, 35 *sq.*
- Tokhma-su, 255, 274
- Tolfa, 571
- Tolistobogii, the, 18, 35
- Tombos, island, 54 *sq.*
- Tombs of Egypt: biographies, 45 *sq.*, 48 *sq.*; 'Valley of Kings,' 52; Ikhnaton's cemetery at, 116 *sq.*; artistic changes, 414 *sq.*; *see* Ch. XV
- Torralba, 'Chellean' implements, 585
- Trajan's column, 39
- Tralles, 559, 615
- Travels of an Egyptian*, 423 *n.*
- Trebizond, 3, 5
- Tremilai, the, 9; *see* Termilai
- Treres, the, 17
- tribus*, 483
- Triphylia, 539
- Tripolis (Syria), 303 *sq.*
- Triton, 289
- Tritonis, lake, 581
- Trmmli; *see* Termilai
- Trocmi, 18, 35
- Tröes, the, 487
- Troezen, 30, 533
- Troy; *see* Ch. XVI (468-472); 454, 465; excavation of site, 2; topography, 3, 4; Dardani, 8; Ilios, 12; defenders of, 17; T., and Thessaly, 30; date of fall, 379; T., and Mycenae, 460, 471 *sq.*; the sixth city, 471; middle Helladic culture, 471 *sq.*; Cypriote pottery at, 472; the Trojan War, 487-497, 511, regarded as an era, 547; T., settlements at, 489; Scaean Gate, 489, 495 *sq.*; Priam's fortress, 489 *sq.*; theory of annual fair at,

- 490; motives for Trojan War, 493;
Greek fleet, 494; date of capture (Greek
chronologists), 497; connection with
Homeric poems, 498; funeral rites, 627;
Athena, 635
Tubal, 272, 546
Tubikhi, 311; *see* Tebah
Tuiu, tomb of, 415 *sq.*, 424
Tu-khi, 300
Tukulti-ninib; *see below*
Tukulti-ninurta, 242 *sq.*, 247, 403
Wadi Tūmilāt, 62, 152 *sqq.*, 178, 359
Tūna, 426
Tunip, 58, 75, 82 *sq.*, 123, 148, 263, 308,
332, 338, 343
Turin, papyrus of 'Book of the Dead' at, 197
Turks in Asia Minor, 3; *see* Scythians, 32;
(modern) attacks on Egypt, 40
Tursci, 282
Tursha (Teresh; ? Etruscans), 8, 167,
231 *sq.*, 276, 282; not Minoans, 286 *sq.*
Turuki, 238
Tuscany, 'terremare' folk in, 571 *sq.*;
Etruscan civilization in, 573 *sq.*
Tushratta, 95, 107, 121 *sq.*, 234, 237, 261
sq., 299, 300 *sqq.*, 311, 330, 335, 337, 385
Tutenkhamon (*or* -ankh-; Nebkheperure'),
name changed from Tutenkhaton, 129;
restorer of Amon, 128 *sq.*, 132; his
tomb, 121, 129 *sq.*, 415, 418, 424
Tutu, 323
Tyana, 15, 269-273, 274; monuments, 255
Tydeus, 477
Tyliossos, 432
Tymbriada, 16
Tyndareus, 477, 479
tyrannis, 550; and religion, 641
Tyre, 58, 137, 266, 303, 306, 319, 322, 332,
382, 396, 581; date of foundation, 379
Tyrrhenians, Tyrsenians, 167, 276, 282;
see Tursha
Tyrtæus, 527 *n.*, 533
- U.* In Arabic names the vowel
(*damma*) is commonly represented by *o*,
e.g. Koran (Kur'an, Quran), Mohammed
(Muhammad). The Latin *-us* has gener-
ally been used in this work for the
Greek *-os*, and *-u* for the Greek *-ou*. *u* is
often used in transliterating Egyptian *w*
even when probably consonantal.
- Uashasha (Weshesh, 173 *sq.*), 268, 283 (*and*
n.), 285, 288; not Osci, 276
Ube, 311, 326
Ugarit, 123, 141, 305
Ukni river, 247
Ullaza, 306, 319
'Umbri', 571 *n.*
Umbrian dialects, 33; people, 35 *sq.*
- Untash-gal, 242 *n.*
Upwawet, 213 *sq.*
Ūr, 257 *sq.*, 350
Ural mountains, 20 *sq.*
Uranus, 610
Urartu, 256
Uriah, 374
Urkhī-Teshub, 319 *sq.*
Urmia, lake, 15
Urrakhinash, 249
Urumā, 249
Urusalim, *see* Jerusalem
Uru(y)anassil, 400; *see* Varuna
Usaphais, 219
ushabti (*shauabti*), 51, 206, 415, 421
Ushpia, 241
Ushti, 245
Utentiu, 281
Utica, 379, 538, 581
Uzu, 306, 319, 326
- V. See W.*
- 'Valley of the Kings', 52, 64, 91, 93, 108,
129 *n.*, 139, 188 *sq.*; spoliation in, 190 *sq.*
Van, 228
Vannic language, 252; records, 256
Vaphio, 455 *sq.*, 539
Varuna, 13, 331, 400, 401 (*and n.*)
Veil, 571
Velchanos, 285, 289
Venedi, the, 38
Veneti, *see* Eneti; 14, 17; inscriptions, 24;
language, 25
Verona, 35, 565
Vettersfelde, 562
Vienna, 35
'Villanovan' civilization, 571 *sq.*; four
periods, 573
Vindobona, 35
Visigoths, descendants (?) in Spain, 23
Vizier, in Egypt, functions of, 43, 45-48,
196, 210; Pharaoh's instructions to,
48 *n.*, 210; *v.* for Syria, 323
Volscians, the, 36
Vrokastro, 447 *sq.*
- W.* For the Semitic *w* the English
Bible uses *v* (*e.g.* Jehovah).
- Wales, 'Aurignacian' population in, 565
Washshukkani, 230
Wawat, 53 *sq.*
Weapons; *see* Bronze, Iron
Weaving, in Syria, 329
Wenamón, 192 *sqq.*, 295, 307, 339; Story
of, 224, 321, 326, 330, 333, 335, 343 *sq.*,
346
Wends, the, 38
Weni, 211
Weshesh, the, 173 *sq.*; *see* Uashasha

'White House' (treasury) of Egypt, 44
 Wills, copies filed in Egypt, 46
 'Wiros,' 15, 23; dispersion, 28; vocabulary
 and climate, 29; dispersal of dialects, 33
 Writing: in Europe, 36; cuneiform, 57,
 335 n.; Egyptian influence in Crete, 98;
 in Palestine, 333; Minoan, pictographic,
 437; at Mycenae, etc., 463; Homeric
 poems, 508; Cyprus, syllabic script, 546;
 Carian, 556; *see* Alphabet, Cuneiform
 Wulfil's translation of the Bible, 39

I. See J.

Ya, Ya-tum, Ya-u-ti, 349
 Yabin; *see* Jabin
 Yabniel, 357
 Yafa, 313
 Yahu, 349 sq.
 Yahweh, 285 sq., 342 sq., 345-351 *passim*,
 Ch. XIV (rise of Israel) *passim*; form of
 name, 353 n. (*see* I, p. 185 n.); Mesha's
 inscription, 394; rise of Yahwism, 404 sq.,
 406 n.; and Varuna, 401
 Yankhamu, Ch. XIII; *see* 323 sq., 384
 Yantina (Yatnana), 281
 Yanuamma (Yenoam), 311
 Yapa-addi (Yapakh-), 305, 323, 336
 Yapakhi, 322, 342, 357
 Yaphia', 357
 Yapu, 313; *see* Joppa
 Yarimuta (i O.T. Jarmuth), 303, 305,
 323 sq., 353 n., 357
 Yashdata, 331
 Yashubakula, 238
 Yasili Kaia, 270 sq.
 Yasubigalla, 238
 Yau-bi'di, 349
 Yāwān, 276, 281, 545 sq., 560
 Yehem, 68 sq.
 el-Yehūdīyeh, Tell, 152, 417
 Yeno'ām, 135, 165, 169, 311, 319 sq., 331,
 344, 381
 Yether (Jether, Jethro), 395
 Yewanna (Yāwān), 281
 Yezidis, the, 232
 Yortan, 555
 Yunanat, 310
 Yuni, 301
 Yurša, 314
 Yurūka, the, 6
 Yuzgad, 254 ●

Z. *z* is used to represent the emphatic
 Arabic *ẓā* (ظ), for which other systems
 have *tz* or *z*, or even *z* (the last being

otherwise used for *ṣād* [ص] for which *ṣ*
 is employed here). In Egyptian trans-
 literations use is made of *s* and *z*, and also
ḏ; *see s.v.* Zakkal. In the O.T. *z* often
 represents *ṣ* (e.g. Zadok).

Zab, lesser, 238; lower, 250 sq.
 Zaban, 244
 Zacynthus, 480
 Zādōk (*ṣādōk*), 371, 395, 397
 Zafer Papoura, 440
 Zahi, 81, 300, 321
 Zakaray, the, 173 n.; ? = Zakro, 294 sq.; ? =
 Teucrians, 491; *see* Zakkal
 Zakar-baal of Byblus, 192 sq., 307, 329 sq.,
 333, 336, 338, 346, 351, 378
 Zakkal (*also* Zakaray, *q.v.*, Thekel, *see*
 173 n., Tjakarai), 268, 283-285, 320,
 380
 Zakro, 284 n., 294, 432, 438 sq.
 Zalkhi, 305
 Zamama; *read* Ilbaba
 Zammit, 578
 Zārephath, 326
 Zatatna, 332
 Zebāra, 138
 Zebō'im, 314
 Zehūlūn, 313, 370, 399
 Zedekiah, 384 n.
 Zelea, 488
 Zenjirli, 255, 262, 270, 430
 Zenodotus, 14
 Zephāth, 359, 365
 Zeugma, 255
 Zeus, and Leleges, 10; and *Iliad*, 498 sqq.,
 515 sq.; of Dodona, 531, Ch. XXII *passim*;
 Agoraios, 630; Boulaioi, 630; Branchus,
 552; (Carian), 10; Eleutherios, 630;
 Enalios, 629; Herkeios, 630; Horkios,
 630; Keraunos, 623; Krētagenēs (Vel-
 chanos), 285, 289; Ktēsios, 630; La-
 phystian, 618, 621; (Lycæan), 619;
 Meilichios, 630; (Olympian), 485; Pan-
 hellenios, 629; Patrōos, 630; (Pelagian),
 486; Phratrōos, 630; Polieus, 630; Xenios,
 630
 Zikar, 309, 325, 328, 336
 Ziklag, 285, 291, 372, 380, 392
 Zimrida, 304 sq., 306, 332, 337, 357
 Zinzar, 263, 310; e.g. Senzar
 Zir-Bashan, 311, 331
 Zōbah, 310, 391
 Zōr'ah (*zor'ah*), 314, 326
 Zoroastrianism, 400
 Zugagi, 237
zakin (*sōkēn*), 322
 Zygyouria, 463-465

INDEX TO MAPS

Each map has its own index and reference is made here only to its number. The second map on No. 3 is distinguished as 3*, and that of Gozo as 15*. The alphabetical arrangement ignores the usual prefixes (lake, etc.), and also, with the exception of the map of Malta (15), the Arabic article (el-) and the terms Jebel (mountain), Kefr (village), Khirbet (ruin), Nahr (river), Tell (mound), Umm (mother), Wādi (valley).

As the maps are from different sources and different spellings and identifications are current, cross-references have been made and, in certain cases, attention is called to the fact that a particular form is the Assyrian or cuneiform (*a*), biblical (*b*), classical (*c*), Egyptian (*e*), Hebrew (*h*) or modern native form (*m*)¹.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Abantes, 11 | 'Ain-Jälūd, 7, <i>m</i> | Amma?, 3, <i>a</i> |
| Abarim, Mt, 8 | 'Ain Kudeis, 6, <i>m</i> | Ammon, 7, 8 |
| 'Abdeh, 6 | 'Ain Musa, 6, <i>m</i> | Ammonium or Oasis Siwa, 1 |
| Abdon, 7 | 'Ain el-Wcibeh, 6, <i>m</i> | Amor(ites), 2, 4, 5 (<i>e</i>) |
| Abel, 7 | Ajlan, Kh., 6, <i>m</i> | Amaura, <i>a</i> Amurru) |
| el-Abiad, W., 6 | Ajlun, J., 8, <i>m</i> | Amorgos, 12 |
| Abina, 5 | Akaba, W., Aḳabah, Gulf of, 6 | Amurru, 3, <i>a</i> |
| Abu-Kanadu, W., 6 | Akhetaten, 6 = 'Tell el-Amarna | Amyclae, 10 |
| Abu Kudes, Tell, 7 | Akhlamu, 4, <i>a</i> | 'Anā, Kefr, 7 |
| Abydus (Egypt), 12 | Akkad, 4 | 'Anāb, 3*, <i>m</i> |
| Abydus (Greece), 9 | Akko, 2. See Accho | Anathoth, 7 |
| Abyssinia, 1 | Alashia, 2, <i>a</i> . ? Cyprus | Andalucia, 13 |
| Accho, 3 ('Aka <i>c</i> , Aku <i>a</i> , 'Akkā <i>m</i>) | Alava, 13 | Anemorea, 11 |
| Acheloius, R., 9, 11 | Alban Hills, 14 | Annecy, L., 13 |
| Achzib, 7 | Alcala, 13 | Anṣariye, J. el., 3*, <i>m</i> |
| Adana, 3, <i>a</i> | Alemtejo, 13 | Antandrus, 12 |
| Aden, G. of, 1 | Aleppo, 2, 3, 5 (<i>a</i> , Halpa) | Anthedon, 11 |
| Adramyttium, 12 | Alexandretta, 3*, 12 | Antilibanus, 8 |
| Adulis, 1 | Alexandria, 1, 6 | Antioch, 3* |
| Aduma, 3, <i>e</i> ; -u, 3, <i>a</i> . See Edom | Algarve, 13 | Antiquera, 13 |
| Aegae, 10, 12 | Algeria, 13 | Anti-Taurus, Mts, 5 |
| Aegeum, 9 | Alghero, 14 | Antron, 11 |
| Aegialus, 9, 10 | Allumiere, 14 | Apacsus, 9 |
| Aegina, 9, 10 | Almeria, 13 | Apamea (Asia Minor), 12 |
| Aegium, 10, 11 | Aloa, 1 | Apamea (Syria), 3* |
| Ælanites Sinus, 6, <i>c</i> (Gulf of Elah) | Alope, 11 | Aphroditopolis, 6 |
| Aenus, 9 | Alpheus, R., 9 | Apollonia ad Rhyndacum, 12 |
| Aeolis, 12 | Alshe, 5 | Apollonia Pontica, 12 |
| Aesepus, R., 9, 12 | Altaku, 2, <i>a</i> (<i>b</i> , Eltekeh) | 'Arābah, the, 7, 8 |
| Aethices, 11 | Alzi, 4 | —, Sea of, 7 |
| Aethiopia, 1 | Amalekites, 7 | Arabia, 1, 8 |
| Aetolians, 9, 11 | Amanus, Mts, 2, 4, 12 | —, Petraea, 6 |
| 'Afrin, N., 3 | el-Amarna, Tell, 6 | Arad, 2, 3*, 6, 7 |
| Aijalon, 2, 7 (<i>a</i> , Ayaluna, 3*) | Ama(u)ra(a), 3, <i>e</i> , Amurru, <i>a</i> | Araethyrea, 10 |
| 'Ain Hawārah, 6, <i>m</i> | Amida, 4 | Araina, 2, <i>e</i> |
| 'Ainltha, 7, <i>m</i> | Amisus, 12 | Aramaeans, 5, 7 |
| | Amki, 2, 3, <i>a</i> | Aranti, 3, <i>e</i> (= Orontes) |
| | | 'Ar'ara, 3*, <i>m</i> (= <i>a</i> Araru, <i>b</i> Aroer) |

¹ The Assyrian and Egyptian forms of biblical place-names, so far as they are at present known, may be found in A. Jirku, *Altoriental. Kommentar* (p. 665 above).

Arasa, 3 (*e* ? Cyprus. *See* Alashia)
 Aratāt, 3, *e*
 Araziki, 4
 Arbela, 4
 Arcadia, 9, 10
 Arene, 10
 Argæus, Mt, 12
 Argar, El, 13
 Argob, 8
 Argos, 9, 10
 Arinna, 5
 Arisbe, 9
 el-'Arish, and Wadi, 6, *m*
 'Arkā, 3, 3*, *m* (*b* Arkite)
 Armada, 3*, *c* (*b* Arvad)
 Arne, 11
 Arnon, R., 7, 8
 Aroer, 7 (*m* 'Ar'ara)
 Arpad, 5
 Arsinoë, 6
 Aruna, 2
 Arvad, 2, 3, 4 (*m* Arwād, *a* Armada)
 Arzanibiu, 4
 Arzawa (?), 5
 Arzukhina, 4
 Ascania, Lake, 9
 Ashdod, 2, 7
 Asher, 3 (*e* Aseru), 7
 Ashkelon or Askalon, 2, 3, 7 (*m* Askalan, *a* Ashkaluna, *e* Askaruni)
 'Ashtārōth, 7 (*e* 'Astiratu, 3)
 Ashur (city), 4, 5
 el-'Aṣī, N., 3, *m* (= Orontes)
 Asine, 10
 Aspendus, 12
 Aspledon, 11
 Assarlik, 12
 Assuan (Aswān), 1
 Assyria, 1, 4, 5
 Asterium, 11
 Asturias, 13
 Astypalaea, 12
 Atbara, R., 1
 Athens, 9, 11
 Athribis, 6
 Athos, Mt, 9
 Atri, 14
 'Aṣṣārūs, J., 7
 Aufidena, 14
 Aulis, 9, 11
 Avaris, *c*, 6
 el-Awja, 6
 Axius, R., 9
 Axumia, 1
 Ayaluna. *See* Aijalon
 el-Azrek, W., 6
 Azzati, 3*, *a* (*See* Gaza)

Ba'albek, 3*
 Baal Zephon, 6
 Babylon, 1, 4, 5
 — in Egypt, 6
 Babylonia, 1, 4
 Baghdad, 1
 Bahria, 15
 Baḥr Lūt, 3*, 8, *m*
 Balearic Isles, 13
 Barga, 4
 Barletta, 14
 el-Baruk, W., 6
 Bashan, 7; Hill of B., 8
 Bastia, 14
 Bātrūn, 3*
 Beerōth, 7
 Beersheba, 6, 7 (*m* Bir es-Seba')
 Beira, 13
 Beirut, 1, 2, 3*, 4 (*a* Biruna, Birutu)
 Belikh, R., 5
 Belmonte Piceno, 14
 Bene-berak, 7
 Berenice, 1
 Beth-Anoth, 2
 Bethel, 7, 8
 Beth-haram, 7
 Beth-horon, Lower and Upper, 2, 7
 Beth-lehem (Judah), 7
 — (Zebulun), 7
 Beth-shean (or -shan), 2, 7
 Beth-shemesh, 7
 Beth-zur, 6, 7
 Bet Jibrin, 7 (*c* Eleutheropolis = ? *b* Gath)
 Bezek, 7
 Bir Birein, 6
 Bir es-Seba', 6 (*b* Beersheba)
 Bīrejik, 5
 Biruna, Birutu. *See* Beirut
 Bisceglie, 14
 Bisenzio, 14
 Bishri, Mt, 4
 Bismantova, 14
 Bithynia, 12
 Bitter Lakes, 6
 el-Biyar, W., 6
 Black Sea, 1
 Boebe, 11
 Boebeis, L., 9, 11
 Boeotians, 11
 Boghaz Keui, 1, 5, 12
 Bologna, 14
 Borg En-Nadur, 15
 Borsippa, 4
 Branchidae, 12
 Bryseae, 10
 Bubastis, 6

Bukana, 15
 Buprasium, 10, 11
 Burlus, Lake, 6
 Burmeghez, 15
 Busiris, 6
 Buto, 6
 el-Buttauf, 8
 el-Bwēra, W., 6
 Byblus, 1, 2, 3, 3* (*b* Gebal)
 Cabul, 7
 Caicus, R., 12
 Cairo, 6
 Calydnæ, 9
 Calydon, 9, 11
 Calymna, 12
 Camirus, 9, 12
 Cappadocia, 12
 Capri, 14
 Capua, 14
 Caravan routes from Egypt to Hebron; and from Mecca to Cairo, 6
 Carchemish, 2, 4, 5
 Cardamyle, 12
 Caria, 12
 Carians, 9
 Carmel, Mt, 8
 Carnai, 13
 Carpathos, 12
 Carthage, 13
 Carystus, 9
 Caspian Sea, 1
 Castellazzo, 14
 Casteluccio, 13, 14
 Castenedolo, 14
 Casus, 9, 12
 Catalonia, 13
 Cataracts on the Nile, 1
 Caunus, 12
 Cayster, R., 12
 Celaenae, 12
 Celenderis, 12
 Celtiberi, 13
 Cephallenians, 9
 Cephissus, R., 11
 Cerinthus, 11
 Cervetri, 14
 Chalcis, 11
 — in Euboea, 9, 11
 Chalybea, 12
 Chios, 9, 12
 Chircop, 15
 Chiusi, 14
 Cicones, 9
 Ciempozuelos, 13
 Cilicia, 12
 Cilician Gates, 12
 — Taurus, 3*
 Cilla, 12
 Cimmerians, 13

- Cisternio, 14
 Clarus, 12
 Clazomenae, 12
 Cleonae, 10
 Cleopatra, 6
 Cnidus, 12
 Cnossus, 9
 Cogul, 13
 Colophon, 12
 Como, 14
 S. Cono di Licodia, 14
 Constantine, 13
 Copae, 11
 Coppa Navigata, 14
 Corinth, 9, 10, 11
 Corneto, 14
 Coronea, 11
 Corradino, 15
 Correcchio, 14
 Corsica, 13, 14
 Cos, 9, 12
 Cranae, 10
 Crapathus, 9 (*see* Carpathos)
 Crete, 1, 9, 12, 13
 Crisa, 11
 Cumae, 14
 Curetes, 11
 Cydonians, 9
 Cyllene, Mt, 10
 Cyme, 12
 Cynus, 11
 Cyparissae, 10
 Cyprus, 1, 2, 3*, 5, 12, 13
 (*e* Arasa, *a* Alashia)
 Cyrene, 1
 Cythera, 9
 Cyzicus, 12

 Dahab, 6
 Damascus, 1, 2, 3*, 5, 8
 (*a* Timashgi)
 ed-Dāmlīyeh, 7
 Dan, 7
 Danube, R., 13
 Daphnae, 6
 Dardani(ans), 9, 13
 Darfur, 1
 Daulis, 11
 Dead Sea, 3*, 6, 8
 Deb-Dieba, 15
 Debir, 6
 Delos, 9
 Deper, 2, *e*
 Der ez-Zor, 4
 el-Dersa, W., 6
 ed-D(h)ahariyeh (*b* Debir),
 6, 7
 Dia, 9
 Dibon, 7
 Didyma, 12
 Dimashka, 3*

 Dindymus, Mt, 12
 Dium, 11
 Dizahab, 6
 Dodona, 9, 11
 Dolopes, 11
 Dor, 2, 3, 5, 7
 Doris, 12
 Dorium, 10
 Dorylaeum, 12
 Dōthān, 7, 8
 Douro, R., 13
 Dulichium, 9, 11
 Dunip, 3*
 Dur-Kurigalzu, 4

 Ebal, Mt, 7, 8
 Ebro, R., 13
 Echinae, 9, 11
 Ed-Dara, 15*
 Edom, 2, 6, 7, 8
 Edom or Idumea, 6
 Edrei, 3, 7
 Eglon, 6
 Egypt, 1, 6
 — River of, 6 (*m* W. el-
 'Arish)
 Eiones, 10
 Ekereth, 2, *e* (*a* Ugarit)
 Ekrōn, 7
 Elam, 4
 El Argar, 13
 Elath, Eloth, 6
 Elbe, R., 13
 Eleutherus, R., 2
 Elis, 10, 11
 Emathia, 9
 Endor, 7
 En-gannim, 7
 En-Gedi, 6, 7, 8
 Epeans, 9, 10
 Ephesus, 12
 Ephraim, 8
 Ephyra, 11
 Epidaurus, 10
 Epirus, 13
 Erech, 4
 Eretria, 9, 11
 Erfād Tell, 3*, *m* (*b* Arpad)
 Eridu, 4
 Erkatu, 2, *e*
 Erymanthus, Mt, 10
 Erythrae, 11, 12
 Esdrēlon (Esdraelion), Plain
 of, 7, 8, p. 69 (*b* Jezreel)
 Este, 14
 Estremadura, 13
 Etam, 6
 Et(h)am, 6
 Etruria, 13
 Et-Torri Tal-Mramma, 15*
 Euboea, 9, 11

 Eulaeus, R., 4
 Euphrates, R., 1, 2, 5, 12
 Eutresis, 11
 Euyuk Alaja, 5
 Ezion Geber, 6
 Ez-Zebbieh, 15

 Fabriano, 14
 Falerii, 14
 Far'a, W., 4
 Fēnān, 6
 Fer'ata, 7
 Fermo, 14
 Fetah, W., 6
 Fikre, W., 6
 Florence, 14
 Fontanella, 14
 Fromm Er-Rich, 15

 Gabelia, J., 6
 Gafsa, 13
 el-Galala, J., 6
 Galicia, 13
 Galilee, 8
 Gallia, 13
 Gargamish (Carchemish), 5
 Gari, 3*
 Garonne, R., 13
 Garsaura, 5
 Gašara, 3, *e* (= Gezer)
 Gašat, 3, *e* (= Gath)
 Gasga or Kash, 5
 Gathi, 7. *See* Bet Jibrin,
 Gimti
 Gauraina, 5
 Gavr'inis, 13
 Gaza, 6, 7 (*a* Azzati)
 Geba, 7
 Gebel Ciantar, 15
 Gefi, W., 6
 Gem Aton, 1
 Gennesaret, Lake of, 3*, 8
 Gera, W., 6
 el-Geraia, W., 6
 Gerizim, Mt, 7, 8
 Germania, 13
 Gerona, 13
 Gezer, 2, 3, 3*, 7 (*m* Jezer,
 a Gazri, *e* Gašara)
 Ghadames, 13
 Ghammar, 15
 Ghar Dalam, 15
 Gharib, J., 4
 el-Ghor, 6
 Ghuzzeh, 6
 Gibeah, 7
 Gibeon, 7
 Gibraltar, 13
 Gidshi, 3*, *a* (*b* Kadesh)
 Gigantia, 15
 Gilboa, Mt, 7, 8

- Gilead, 7, 8
 Gimiti, 3* (Gath ?)
 Glaphyrae, 11
 Glisas, 11
 Gneima Bay, 15
 Gök-su, 3*
 Gonoessa, 10
 Gordium, 12
 Gortyna, 9
 Goshen, Land of, 6
 Gozo, 13, 15
 Granicus, R., 12
 Great Plain, 7
 Great Sea (Mediterranean), 6
 Gryneia, 12
 Guadalquivir, R., 13
 Guadiana, R., 13
 Gubli, 3*, a (= Byblus)
 Gurgum, 5
 Gygaean Lake, 9
 Gyron, 11

 Hadrumetum, 13
 Hagi-ar-Kim, 15
 Hagra Wiekfa, 15
 Hagri Ta Samsun, 15*
 Halak, Mt (J. Hālāk), 6
 Haliartus, 11
 Halicarnassus, 12
 Halpa (Aleppo), 5
 Hal-Safienī, 15
 Hal-Tarxien, 15
 Halys (Red River), 5, 12
 Hamath, 2, 5 (e Hametu)
 Hamatu, 3
 Hanigalbat, 4, 5
 Hapharaim, 2
 Harabu, 3
 el-Hārithiyeh, 7
 Harma, 11
 Harrān, 4
 Harri, 5
 Hārūn, J., 6
 Hasi, Tell el-, 3 (b Lachish)
 Hatti, 3*, 5. See Hittites
 Hattina, 5
 Hauran, 2, 3*, 8
 Hazezon-Tamar, 8
 Hazor, 7
 Hebron, 3*, 6, 7, 8
 'Height of Wan,' 2
 Helice, 10
 Heliopolis, 1, 6
 Hellas, 11
 Helos, 10
 Herakleopolis, 6
 Herenkeru, 2
 Hermione, 10
 Hermón, 3*, 7, 8
 Hermopolis Magna, 6
 — Parva, 6

 Hermus, R., 9, 12
 Sinus Heroopolites (Gulf of Suez), 6
 Heshbon, 7
 el-Hesay, Tell, 6 (b Lachish)
 Hieromax, R. (Yarmuk), 8
 Hinatuni, 3* (b Hannathon)
 Hinianabi, 3* (b Anab)
 Hippo Diarrhytus, 13
 Hippo Regius, 13
 Hispania, 13
 Histiae, 9, 11
 Hittites, 1, 2, 5 (a Hatti, Khatti, e Kheta, Khettē)
 Homs, 3*
 Hor, Mt, 8
 Horeb, Mt, 6
 H'reibe, 6
 H'saira, J. Umm, 6
 Huditi, 3
 Hüleh, Lake, 3, 7, 8
 Hyampolis, 11
 Hyde, Mt, 9
 Hyle, 11
 Hyperesia, 10
 Hypothebae, 9, 11
 Hyrmine, 10

 Ialysus, 9, 12
 Iasus, 12
 Icaria, 12
 Ida, Mt, 9, 12
 Illyria, 13
 Imbros, 9, 12
 Imerese, 13, 14
 Indus, R., 12
 Iolcus, 9, 11
 Ionia, 12
 Irbid, Kh., 7
 Iris, R., 12
 Irkātā, 3* (b Arkite)
 Iron, 7
 Ishuwa, 5
 Isi, 2, e (?) Cyprus)
 Isin, 4
 Ismarus, 9
 Issachar, 7
 Italia, Italy, 13, 14
 Ithaca, 9, 10, 11
 Iton, 11
 Iviza, 13

 Jabbok, R., 7, 8
 Jabneel, 7
 Jalūd, Nahr, 7
 Japho, 7 (Joppa)
 Jaulān, Plateau of, 8
 Jebeil, 3*
 Jefāt, 3*
 Jehud, 7
 el-Jeib, W., 6

 el-Jeraf, W., 6
 Jerar, Umm-, 6
 Jericho, 7
 Jerusalem, 1, 2, 3*, 7, 8
 Jezer, 3*
 Jezreel, Plain of, 7, 8. See Esdrelon
 Jihan, R., 3*
 Jil'ad, J., 7
 Jiljulieh, 7
 Jiphtah-ēl, 3*
 Joppa, 3, 7, 8 (h Yapho, a, e Yapu)
 Jordan, R., 2, 3, 3*, 8
 Joseph, 7
 Jotapata, 3*
 Judaea, Wilderness of, 8
 Judah, 7
 Juttah, 6

 el-Kaa, Plain of, 6
 Kadesh (Barnea), 6
 Kadesh (Naphthali) 2, 6, 7
 Kadesh (on the Orontes), 3, 3*, 4, 5, f. 145
 Kadis, Kh., 7
 Kadma, 3
 Kalakh, 4
 Kallilia, 15
 Kana'an, 3 (Canaan)
 Kanah, 7
 Kanes, 5
 Kara Su, 3*
 Karduniash, 5
 Karkar (Qarqar), 2
 Karmel, J., 3* (b Carmel)
 Karn, 7
 Kash or Gasga, 5
 Kashiari, Mt, 4
 Kashkai, 4
 Kashshi, 4
 el-Kasimiyeh, Nahr, 7
 Kasius, Mons, 6
 Katerina, J., 6
 Katna, Ketne, 2, 3*
 el-Kebir, Nahr, 2, 3*
 Keftiu, 1
 Keilah, 7
 Kerak, 7
 Khabor, R., 4, 5
 el-Khalasa, 6
 el-Khalil, 3* (b Hebron)
 Khalpash, 4, a (Aleppo)
 Khartum, 1, 6
 Kharu, 3
 Khatti, 1
 Kheta(-e), 3 (= Hatti)
 Khôr, 3
 Kidron, R., 8
 Kidshi, 3*
 Kina, brook, p. 69

Kinakhkhi, 3*, a
 Kinnereth, Sea of, 7
 Kinsi, 3*
 Kinza, 5
 Kiriath-jearim, 7
 Kirkhi, 4
 Kish, 4
 Kishōn, R., 7, 8
 Kisil Irmak, R., 1
 Kissuwadna, 5
 Kode, 3, 5
 Krokodilopolis, 6
 Kubli, 3* (b Gebal)
 el-Ḳuds (= Jerusalem), 3*
 Kumani, 4, 5
 Kummukh, 4, 5
 Kupni (Geba), 3
 Kurti, 4
 Kush, 1
 Kutha, 4
 Ḳuṭi, 4

 Lacedaemon, 9, 10
 Lachish, 2, 3*, 6, 7
 el-Lādikīyye, 3*
 Lagash, 4
 Laish (Dan), 7
 Lakis(i), 3*
 Lampedusa, 13
 Lampsacus, 12
 Laodicea, 3*
 Lapana, 3*, 5
 Larisa, 12
 Larsa, 4
 Las, 10
 La Tène, 13
 Latium, 13
 Latmus, Mt, 12
 Lebanon, Mt, 2, 3, 3*,
 7, 8
 Lebedus, 12
 Lebinthos, 12
 Lebonah, 7
 Lecce, 14
 Lehian, W., 6
 Lejā, The, 8
 Lejjun, 3*
 Lemnos, 9
 Leontes, R., 3, 8
 Leontopolis, 6
 Leptis magna, 13
 Leros, 12
 Lesbos, 9, 12
 Letopolis, 6
 Leucos Limen, 1
 Libneh, 3*
 Libyan Desert, 1
 Libyana, 1
 Ligures, 13
 Lilaea, 11
 Lindus, 9

Liṭāni, R. (N. el-Ḳasimīyeh),
 2, 7, 8
 Lixus, 13
 Locri, 9, 11
 Locri (Italy), 14
 Lod, 7 (Lydda)
 Loire, R., 13
 Los Millares, 13
 Lussan, W., 6
 Lūt, Baḥr, 3*, 8
 Lycaonia, 12
 Lycia, 9, 12
 Lyctus, 9
 Lydda, 8
 Lydia, 12

 Macedonia, 13
 Macestus, R., 12
 Machir or Manasseh, 7
 Maddalena, 15
 Maeander, R., 12
 Maeonians, 9
 Maghara, W., 1
 Magidda, 3* (Megiddo)
 Magnesia ad Maeandrum,
 12
 Magnesia ad Sipylum, 12
 Magnetes, 11
 Majorca, 13
 Makida, 3*
 Malaṭia, 4
 Malea, C., 9
 Mallus, 12
 Malta, 13, 15
 Mannai, 4
 Mannus, 3
 Mantinea, 10
 Maon, 7
 Mar'ash, 3*, 5
 Mārdin, 4
 Marfa, 15
 Marnus, 3
 Marsa, 15
 'Marshes, The,' 1
 Marsiliana, 14
 Martu, 3*
 Masada, 6
 Mases, 10
 el-Maskūta, Tell, 6
 Matera, 14
 Matrensa, 13, 14
 Maxyes (Meshwesh), 1
 Maycin, W., 6
 Mazaca, 5
 Medeba, 7
 Megara Hyblaea, 13, 14
 Megiddo, 2, 3*, 7, p. 69
 Meliboea, 11
 Memphis, 1, 6
 Menzala, Lake, 6
 Meroe, 1

Meshwesh (Maxyes), 1
 Messa, 10
 Messapia, 13
 Methone, 11
 Methymna, 12
 Mgiar, 15
 Michmash, 7
 Midaeum, 12
 Midian, 6
 Migdol, 6
 Miletus (in Asia Minor), 9,
 12
 Miletus (in Crete), 9
 Milid(ia), 4, 5
 Mindu, Tell Nebi, 3*
 Minho, R., 13
 Minorca, 13
 Minyae, 11
 Misrah Sinjura, 15
 Misri, 3*
 Mitanni, 2, 4, 5
 Mitylene, 12
 Mnaira, 15
 Moab, 2, 7, 8
 Moaida, 14
 Moeris, Lake, 6
 Moesia, 13
 el-Mōjib, W., 8
 Molfetta, 14
 Mons Kasius, 6
 Monti Lessini, 14
 Mopsucrene, 12
 Mopsuestia, 12
 Morocco, 13
 el-Mudīk, Ḳal'at, 3*
 M'ugem, 13
 Murattash, 4
 Murcia, 13
 Mūsa, W., 6
 Mushki, 4, 5
 Muṣri, 4
 Musta, 15
 Mycale, Mt, 9, 12
 Mycalessus, 11
 Mycenae, 9, 10
 Mylasa, 12
 Myrina, 12
 Myrsinus, 10
 Mysia, Mysians, 9, 12
 Myua, 12

 Naḡdos, 12
 Naharin, 2, 3*
 Nairi, 4
 Napata, 1
 Naphtali, 7
 en-Nār, W., 7
 Nash, W., 6
 Naucratis, 1, 6
 Navarra, 13
 Nazana, 3

Nazareth, 8
 Nebo, Mt, 7, 8
 Negeb, The, 8
 Nekhl, 6
 Neonteichos, 12
 Nidastore, 14
 Nile Cataracts, 1
 Nile, White and Blue, 1
 Nimrin, Tell, 7
 Nineveh, 1, 4, 5
 Niphates, Mts, 4
 Nippur, 4
 Nisa, 9, 11
 Nisyrus, 9
 Niy, 2, 5
 Noph, 6
 Notium, 12
 Novilara, 14
 Nuges, 2 = [below]
 Nukhashshi, 3*, 5
 Numana, 14

 Oasis Magna, 1
 Oasis Parva, 1
 Oasis Siut, 1
 Oasis Siwa, 1
 Ocalea, 11
 Odroh, 6
 Oetylus, 9, 10
 Olenus, 9, 10, 11
 Olizon, 11
 Olmo, 14
 Oloosson, 9, 11
 Olympus, Mt, 9, 11
 On, 6
 Onchestus, 11
 Onias, 6
 Ono, 3
 Opus, 11
 Oran, 13
 Orchomenus, 10, 11
 Ormenium, 11
 Orneae, 10
 Orontes, R., 3, 3*, 4, 5, 12
 Ortigueira, 13
 Orvieto, 14
 Osci, 13
 Ossa, Mt, 9, 11
 Otara'a, 3
 Othu, 2 (*see* Usû, map 3)
 Oxyrhynchus, 6

 Paeonians, 5
 Palermo, 13, 14
 Palmella, 13
 Palmyra (Tadmor), 4
 Pamphylia, 12
 Panopeus, 11
 Pantalica, 14
 Pantelleria, 13
 Paphlagonia, 12

Paraetionium, 1
 Paran, Wilderness of, 6
 Parthenius, R., 12
 Patara, 12
 Patmos, 12
 Pedasus, 10
 Pelasgic Argos, 9, 11
 Pelion, Mt, 9, 11
 Pellene, 10
 Pelusium, 6
 Peneus, R., 9, 11
 Peraebi, 11
 Percate, 9
 Perea, 11
 Perga, 12
 Pe-Sapdu, 6
 Pessinus, 12
 Petra, 6, 8
 Phaeacia (?), 9
 Phacstus, 9
 Phakusa, 6
 Pharan, 6
 Pharis, 10
 Phaselis, 12
 Pheae, 9, 10
 Pheneus, 10
 Pherae, 9, 10, 11
 Philistia, 7, 8
 Phocaea, 12
 Phocians, 9, 11
 Phoenician Coast, 7
 Phryges, 9
 Phrygia, 12
 Phthia, 11
 Phthiri (?), 9
 Phylace, 11
 Pianello, 14
 Pianosa, 14
 Pi-Beseth, 6
 Piedmont, 14
 Pieria, 9
 Pisidia, 12
 Pitane, 12
 Pithom, 6
 Pitigliano, 14
 Pityea, 9
 Plataea, 11
 Pleuron, 11
 Ponte Leccia, 14
 Populonia, 14
 Posidium, 6
 Praeneste, 14
 Pteleum, 11
 Pteria, 12
 Punt, 1
 Purasati, 3
 Putru, 5
 Pylene, 11
 Pylus, 9, 10
 Pyramus, R., 5, 12
 Pyrasus, 11

Pytho, 9, 11

Qarqar (Karkar), 2

Rabbath-ammon, 7
 Rakoti, 6
 Ramah, 7
 Ramanan, 3, e
 Ramses, 6
 Raphia, 3, 3*, 6 (e Rapeh)
 Râs el-Abyad, 7, 8
 Râs en-Nâkûrah, 8
 Râs Sufsafeh, 6
 Red Sea, 1, 6
 Refah, 3*, 6
 Rehoboth, 6
 Rekem, 6
 Remedello, 14
 Restan, 5
 el-Retabeh, Tell, 6
 Ret(e)nu, 3*
 Reuben, 7
 er-Rheibe, 6
 Rhine, R., 13
 Rhinocolura, 6, 7
 Rhodes, 9, 12
 Rhone, R., 13
 Rhyndacus, R., 12
 Rhytium, 9
 Riblah, 2, p. 145
 Rimini, 14
 Rimmon, 7
 Robla, W., 6
 Romanelli, 14
 Rome, 14

Sa'ara, 3
 Sabket Bardawil, 6
 eş-Şâfieh, Tell, 3*
 Sagalassus, 12
 Saida, 3*
 St Paul's Bay, 15
 Sajur, R., 5
 Sakema, 3
 Salamis, 9, 11, 12
 Salina Bay, 15
 es-Salt, 7
 Salt Sea, 6, 8
 Sam'al, 2, 5
 Samara, 3
 Samaria, 3, 7, 8
 Samos, 9, 10, 11, 12
 Samsat, 5
 Sangarius, R., 5, 9, 12
 S. Lucia, 14
 S. Maria Tal-Bakkari, 15
 Santa Verna, 15*
 Saône, R., 13
 Saradaush, 4
 eş-Şarâr, W., 7

- Šarbūt (Serabit) el-Khādem, 1
 Sardes or Sfarm (Sparta), 5
 Sardinia, 13, 14
 Sarduna, 3
 Sarmatians, 13
 Sarābeh, 7
 Šartene, 14
 Šaru, 3
 Šarus, R., 5, 12
 Sauko, 3
 Š'baīta, 6
 Scala Tyriorum, 7
 Scamander, R., 12
 Scarphea, 11
 Scolus, 11
 Scyrus, 9
 Scythians, 13
 Sebastīye, 3*
 Seihun, 3*
 Seine, R., 13
 Seir, 2, 6, 8
 Sela, 6, 8
 Sengara, 4
 Sennar, 1
 Senzar, 2. *See* Sinsara
 Serabit. *See* Sarbut
 Sestus, 9
 Sety I (Monument), 3
 Sevilla, 13
 Shabtuna, p. 145
 Sharon, Plain of, 7, 8
 Sharūhen, 2, 3
 Šatt' el-Gharraf, R., 4
 Shaua, Mt., 3
 Shechem, 7, 8
 eah-Sheikh Sa'd, 3
 Šhēphēlah, The, 7, 8
 Sheraif, J., 6
 Shiloh, 7
 Shomer, J. Umm, 6
 Shubari, 4
 Shunem, 2, 7
 Shur, Wilderness of, 6
 Sicily, Sicily, 13, 14
 Sicyon, 9, 10
 Side, 12
 Sidon, 1, 2, 3, 3*
 Simeon, 7
 Simyra, 2, 4
 Sin, Wilderness of, 6
 Sinai, Mt., 6
 Sinai, Peninsula of, 1, 6
 Sinope, 12
 Sinsara, 3. *See* Senzar
 Sinus Heroopolites, 6
 Sippar, 4
 Sipyli, 9, 12
 Sirbonis, Lake, 6
 Smyrna, 12
 es-Sōbak, 6
 Socoh, 2, 7
 Soleb, 1
 Soli, 12
 Solyma, Mt., 9
 Somali Coast, 1
 Sparta, 9, 10
 Speos Artemidos, 6
 Spercheus, R., 9, 11
 Stentinello, 13, 14
 Stratonicea, 12
 Stymphalus, 10
 Styra, 9
 Sudr, W., 5
 Suessula, 14
 Suez, 6
 Sugi (?), 4
 Šumur, 3*
 Sutu, 4
 Syme, 9
 Syria or Zahi, 1
 Syrian Desart, 8
 Syrtis Minor, 13
 Taanach, 2, 7
 Tabal, 4, 5
 Tabariye, 3*
 Tabor, Mt., 3*, 7, 8
 Ta Cenc, 15*
 Tadmor. *See* Palmyra, 4
 Tagus, R., 13
 Tahma, W., 6
 Tahpanhes, 6
 Talavera de la Reina, 13
 Tal-Herba, 15
 Tal-Kaghan, 15*
 Ta Part, 15
 Taphians, 11
 Taranto, 14
 Tarna, 9
 Tarsus, 3*, 5, 12
 Taurus, Mts., 3*, 5, 12
 Taygetus, Mt., 10
 Tēbessa, 13
 Tegea, 9, 10
 Tehenu, 1
 Tekoa, 7
 Telmessus, 12
 Temeh, 1
 Temnos, 12
 Tenedos, 9, 12
 Teos, 12
 Termara, 12
 Termessus, 12
 Termini, 13, 14
 Thamara, 6
 Tharu, 2
 Thaumacia, 11
 Thebes (Asia Minor), 9
 Thebes (Egypt), 1
 Theku, 6
 Thespea, 11
 Thesprotians, 9, 11
 Thisbe, 11
 Thrace, 9
 Thronium, 9, 11
 Thryum, 10
 Tibneh, 7
 Tigris, 1, 4, 5
 el-Tih, Jebel, 6
 Til Barsip, 5
 Timashgi, 3*
 Timmari, 14
 Timsah, Lake, 6
 Tiryns, 10
 Tmolus, Mt., 12
 Tolentino, 14
 Tolfā, 14
 et-Tōr, J., 3*
 Torre di Scalea, 14
 Trapezus, 12
 Tras Osmontes, 13
 Trechis, 11
 Tricca, 9, 11
 Tripoli, 13
 Tritonis, Lake, 13
 Troezen, 10
 Troy, 9, 12
 Tunip, 2, 5
 Tunis, 13
 Tuscany, 14
 Tyana, 5
 Tyre, 1, 2, 3, 3*, 5, 7, 8
 Ubi, 2, 3*
 Ugarit, 2. *See* Ekereth
 Ullaza, 2
 Umbri, 13
 Umbria, 14
 Unki, 5 (Unq, 3)
 Upi, 4
 Ur, 4
 Urartu, 4
 Urusalim, 3*
 Usū, 3*
 Utica, 13
 Valetta, 15
 Valle della Vibrata, 14
 Van, 4
 Veii, 14
 Venetia, 13
 Venosa, 14
 Vetralla, 14
 Vetulonia, 14
 Vicus Judaeorum, 6
 Vulci, 14
 Wan, 2, 3
 Wuta, J., 6
 Xanthus, R., 9
 Xeuchia, 15*
 Xorb El Ghargin, 15

Yabis, W., 7
 Yāfa, Yapa (-u), 3
 Yaraduna, 3
 Yarmuk, Nahr, 7
 Yarpuz, 3*
 Yasraēl, 3
 Yehem, 2
 el-Yehūd, Tell, 6
 el-Yehūdiyah, Tell, 6
 Yellek, J., 6

Yenoam, 2
 Yeraza, 2
 Yokha, 4
 Zacynthus, 9
 Zagros, Mts, 4
 Zahi (or Syria), 1, 3
 Zakkari (Zakkal, Thekel),
 3
 Zammitelo, 15

Zebulun, 7
 Zelea, 9
 Zanjirli, 2, 3*
 ez-Zerkā, Nahr, 7, 8
 Zin, Wilderness of, 6
 Ziph, 7
 Zīṭuna, 3*
 Zoan, 6
 Zorah, 7
 Zycanthus, 10

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

OLD TESTAMENT

| GENESIS | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| vi 4 | 367 | xlvi 10 | 359 |
| x | 546 | xlvi 11 | 324 |
| x 14 | 288 | xlvi 12 | 41 |
| xii | 359 | xlvi 13 | 49 |
| xii 8 sq. | 360 n. | xlvi 14 | 45 |
| xiii 3 sq. | 360 n. | xlvi 15 | 359, 370 |
| xiii 6 | 360 | xlvi 16 | 367 |
| xiv | 385 | xlvi 17 | 359, 363 |
| xiv 7 | 361, 391 n. | xlvi 18 | 358 |
| xiv 14 | 346 | xlvi 19 | 358 |
| xiv 18 | 397 | xlvi 20 | 358 |
| xvi | 384 | xlvi 21 | 358 |
| xvii | 353 | xlvi 22 | 358 |
| xix 21 | 339 | xlvi 23 | 358 |
| xx | 359 | xlvi 24 | 358 |
| xxi | 384, 392 | xlvi 25 | 358 |
| xxii 17 | 328 | xlvi 26 | 358 |
| xxii 24 | 311 | xlvi 27 | 358 |
| xxiii | 385 | xlvi 28 | 358 |
| xxvi | 359, 392 | xlvi 29 | 358 |
| xxvi 1 (see xx 1) | 380 | xlvi 30 | 358 |
| xxviii | 369 | xlvi 31 | 358 |
| xxviii sq. | 368 | xlvi 32 | 358 |
| xxviii 10 | 369 | xlvi 33 | 358 |
| xxviii 22 | 399 | xlvi 34 | 358 |
| xxxi | 336 | xlvi 35 | 358 |
| xxxi 45 | 344 n. | xlvi 36 | 358 |
| xxxi 51-54 | 344 | xlvi 37 | 358 |
| xxxii 21-32 | 383 | xlvi 38 | 358 |
| xxxii 28 | 369 | xlvi 39 | 358 |
| xxxiii 19 | 359 | xlvi 40 | 358 |
| xxxiii 20 | 387 | xlvi 41 | 358 |
| xxxiv | 367, 370, 388 | xlvi 42 | 358 |
| xxxiv 30 | 359 | xlvi 43 | 358 |
| xxxv 1-5 | 360 | xlvi 44 | 358 |
| xxxv 4 | 387 | xlvi 45 | 358 |
| xxxv 8 | 360 | xlvi 46 | 358 |
| xxxv 9 | 369 | xlvi 47 | 358 |
| xxxv 10 | 389 | xlvi 48 | 358 |
| xxxv 19 | 390 | xlvi 49 | 358 |
| xxxv 22 | 367, 390 | xlvi 50 | 358 |
| xxxvi | 366, 393 | xlvi 51 | 358 |
| xxxvi 6 sq. | 360 | xlvi 52 | 358 |
| xxxvii | 298 | xlvi 53 | 358 |
| xxxvii 12 | 359 | xlvi 54 | 358 |
| xxxvii 22, 26 sq. | 374 | xlvi 55 | 358 |
| xxxviii | 359 | xlvi 56 | 358 |
| xxxviii 1 | 360 | xlvi 57 | 358 |
| xli 45 | 360 n. | xlvi 58 | 358 |
| xlvi 21, 27 | 324 | xlvi 59 | 358 |
| xlvi | 358 | xlvi 60 | 358 |
| EXODUS | | | |
| i 10, 15 | 358 | xxxiii 11 | 361 |
| i 11 | 357 | xxxiii 14 | 362 |
| iii | 362 | xxxiv | 364 |
| iii 22 | 358 | xxxv-xl | 364 |
| iv 14 | 363 | | |
| vi 3 | 404 | LEVITICUS | |
| vi 14 | 322 | x | 363 |
| viii 22 | 359 | | |
| ix 26 | 359 | DEUTERONOMY | |
| x 23 | 359 | i 2, 9 sqq. | 362 |
| xii 37 | 358 | i 9-18 | 361 |
| xii 38 | 357 | ii | 366 |
| xiii 17 sq. | 362 | ii sq. | 366 |
| xiv sq. | 385 | ii 9 | 366 |
| xiv 19 | 362 | ii 9 sq. | 367 |
| xv 21 | 386 | ii 16 | 353 |
| xv 22 sqq. | 361 | ii 23 | 286 |
| xv 25 | 391 n. | iii 8 sqq. | 353 |
| xvi | 361 | iii 12-21 | 366 |
| xvi 4, 9-33 | 361 | v 2 | 353 |
| xvii | 362 | vi 16 | 361 |
| xvii 1-7 | 361 | ix 20 | 363 |
| xvii 3 | 361 | ix 22 | 361 |
| xviii | 362, 382 | ix 27 sq. | 342 |
| xviii 5 | 361 | x | 364 |
| xviii 27 | 362 | xi 30 | 370, 387 |
| xix | 361, 362 | xxi | 343 |
| xix 13 | 361 | xxii 7 | 366 |
| xx | 364 | xxvi 5 | 368 |
| xxiii 28 | 363 | xxvi 5-10 | 355 |
| xxiii 29 | 371 | xxvii | 370 |
| xxiv | 343, 363 | xxix 1 | 353, 391 n. |
| xxv-xxx | 364 | xxxii | 405 |
| xxxi 1-11 | 364 | xxxii 16 sq. | 382 |
| xxx 6 | 396 | xxxiii 2 | 364 |
| xxxii | 363 | xxxiii 8 sqq. | 363 |
| xxxii 2 | 364 | xxxiii 21 | 368 |
| xxxii 34 | 362 | xxxiii 23 | 367 |
| xxxiii | 363 | | |
| xxxiii 1-3, 6, 7-11 | 364 | NUMBERS | |
| | | x 12 | 364 |
| | | x 29 | 362, 364 |
| | | x 29- | 382 |
| | | x 30, 33 | 362 |
| | | x 35 sq. | 365 |
| | | xi | 361, 363 |
| | | xi 11-15 | 364 |
| | | xii | 363 |
| | | xiii 22 | 358 |
| | | xiii 26 | 365 |
| | | xiii 33 | 367 |
| | | xiv | 365 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| xiv 14 | 362 | ii 10 | 354 | xiii 7 sq. | 386 |
| xiv 33 | 353 | iii | 370, 385 | xiii 8 | 389 |
| xvi | 363 | iii 1-6 | 371 | xiii 19 | 291 |
| xviii 19 | 398 | iii 5-7 | 382 | xiv | 391 |
| xx 1-14 | 361 | iii 31 | 386 | xiv 15 | 389 |
| xx 4, 19 | 361 | iv | 370, 387 | xiv 29, 33-35 | 389 |
| xx 14, 16 | 365 | iv 4 | 375 | xiv 35, 36 sqq. | 391 n. |
| xx 22-29 | 366 | iv 11 | 367 | xiv 47 | 393 |
| xxi | 366 | iv 16 | 387 | xiv 47-51 | 354 |
| xxi 1-3 | 365 | iv 19 sq. | 386 | xv 30 | 343 |
| xxii 5, 18 | 366 | v | 354, 370, 386, 391 | xvi 12 | 394 n. |
| xxiv 17 (R.V. mg.) | 369 | v 4 | 364 | xvii 4 | 372 |
| xxv | 366 | v 7 | 386 | xvii 7 | 389 |
| xxvi | 358 | v 8 | 389 | xxii 3 | 372 |
| xxvii 14 | 361 | v 14 | 370 | xxv 29 | 339 |
| xxxi 8, 16 | 366 | v 17 | 396 | xxvi | 392 |
| xxxi 19 | 382 | vi sqq. | 298 | xxvii | 393 |
| xxxii | 358 | vi 11 | 387 | xxvii 12 | 393 |
| xxxii sqq. | 366 | vi 11-24 | 388 | xxviii | 391 |
| xxxii 40 | 370 | vi 33 | 391 | xxviii 9 | 391 n. |
| xxxiii 37 | 366 | viii | 370 | xxx | 372 |
| | | viii 5-9, 11, 26 | 386 | xxxi | 291 |
| | | viii 23 | 387 | | |
| iii 16 | 384 | ix | 391 n. | 2 SAMUEL | |
| v | 353 | ix 6 | 387 | i | 354, 372 |
| v 13-15 | 389 | x | 388 | ii | 391 |
| vii 9 | 342 | x 6-16 | 372 | ii 5 sqq. | 373 n. |
| vii 25 sq. | 389 | xi | 366 | ii 14 | 290 |
| viii | 389 | xi 3 | 311 | iii | 373 |
| viii 30 | 370, 391 n. | xi 16 | 361 | iii 6 sqq. | 373 |
| ix 17 | 373 | xii | 370 | iii 13 | 373 |
| ix 18, 26 | 389 | xiii | 388 | iv 5 | 389 |
| x-xii | 321 | xiii 25 | 314 n. | v | 291, 371, 373 |
| x i | 397 | xv 15 | 386 | vi | 394 |
| x 11 | 389 | xvi 27 | 290 | vii | 396 |
| x 41 | 353 n., 359, 390 | xvii sq. | 367, 371, 388 | viii | 310 n. |
| xi 16 | 359 | xviii 12 | 314 n. | viii 14 | 393 |
| xi 21 sqq., 22 | 373 | xviii 28 | 369 | ix 7 | 373 |
| xiii | 353 | xix-xxi | 370, 390 | x | 310 n., 373 n. |
| xiii 3 | 373 | xix 30 | 339 | x 6 | 369 |
| xv 3 | 365 | | | xii 8 | 373 |
| xv 6 | 367 | | | xii 25 | 393, 397 |
| xv 9 | 344 | I SAMUEL | | xii 30 | 394 |
| xv 13-19 | 367 | i 20, 27 sq. | 388 | xiii 23 | 373 |
| xvii 14 sqq. | 370 | ii sq. | 371 | xiv 7 | 394 |
| xviii 1 | 371 | ii 27 | 360 n. | xiv 22 | 343 |
| xviii 16 | 374 | vii 10 | 389 | xv 21 | 340 |
| xviii 17 | 367 | vii 14 | 371, 388 | xvi 8 | 374 |
| xix 28 | 311 | viii | 354 | xvii 27 | 373 n. |
| xxiv | 360, 387 | viii 7 | 387 | xix 43 | 373 |
| xxiv 12 | 363, 387 | ix | 354, 371, 383, 389 | xx | 373 |
| xxiv 22 sq. | 391 n. | x 2 | 390 | xx 18 | 369 |
| xxiv 27 | 344 | x 9 | 339 n. | xxi | 373, 389 |
| | | x 17 sqq. | 354 | xxi 2 | 371, 389 |
| | | x 19 | 387 | xxi 16 | 373 |
| JUDGES | | x 14 | 322 | xxi 17 | 394 |
| i 360, 362, 365, 370, 387 | | xi 14 sq. | 389 | xxi 19 | 393 |
| i 10-20 | 367 | xii | 354, 387 | xxiii | 373 |
| i 16 | 367 | xii 3 | 316 | xxiii 11 sq. | 386 |
| i 17 | 359 | xiii | 354, 386 | xxiii 24 | 393 |
| i 22 | 370 | xiii sq. | 372, 389 | xxiv | 396 |
| ii sq. | 375 | xiii 3 | 383 | xxiv 6 | 344 n. |
| ii 1-5 | 360 | | | | |

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

751

| 1 KINGS | | 2 CHRONICLES | | LAMENTATIONS | |
|---------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------|
| ii | 371 | ii 14 | 396 | i 2 | 338 |
| ii 26 | 373, 395 | ix 8 | 394 | iv 20 | 342 |
| iii 4 | 397 | xxxiv 6 | 367 | EZEKIEL | |
| iv | 332 | EZRA | | xi 19 | 339 n. |
| iv 11 | 380 | viii 21 sq. | 298 | xvi | 319 |
| iv 13 | 312 | NEHEMIAH | | xx | 361 |
| v 3 | 396 | xiii 24 | 289 | xx 25 | 403 |
| v 9 | 329 | PSALMS | | xx 36 | 359 |
| ix 20 sq. | 371 | lviii 10 | 402 | xxv 16 | 285 |
| ix 26 | 361 | civ | 338 | xxvii 13 | 546 |
| xi | 392 | civ 29 sq. | 342 | xxxiv | 321 |
| xi 7 | 394 | cvi 34 sqq. | 382 | xxxvii 14 | 342 |
| xi 7 sq. | 345 | cx 1 | 337 | HOSEA | |
| xii 28 | 363 | cxxii 6 | 337 | i 4 | 364 |
| xv 12 | 402 | cxxxix 7 sq. | 338 | ii 15 | 361 |
| xviii | 404 | PROVERBS | | iii 5 | 394 |
| xix | 365 | xxviii 13 | 347 | iv 13 | 344 |
| 2 KINGS | | ISAIAH | | vii 11 | 382 |
| iii | 393 | i | 399 | ix 10 | 361 |
| viii 19 | 394 | i 26 | 398 | xii 4 | 369 |
| x | 364 | xi 4 | 342 | AMOS | |
| xi 14 | 344 | xi 15 sq. | 405 | i 9 | 396 |
| xvii 24 sqq. | 371 | xix 19 | 344 n. | ii 9 | 367 |
| xix 9 sq. | 335 | xxii 15 | 322 | iii 13 | 394 |
| xxiii 7 | 402 | xxix 1 sq. | 394 | v 6 | 394 |
| 1 CHRONICLES | | xxlii 6 | 338 | v 25 | 361 |
| ii | 367, 375 | xlvi 16-19 | 405 | vii 16 | 394 |
| ii sqq. | 359 | xlvi 20 sq. | 405 n. | viii 14 | 394 n. |
| ii 21 sq., 55 | 368 | xlvi 23 | 339 | ix 7 | 286 |
| ii 23 | 369 | liv 10 | 339 | NAHUM | |
| ii 34 | 367 | JEREMIAH | | iii 17 | 335 |
| ii 52, 54 | 314 n. | ii 2 sqq. | 361 | HABAKKUK | |
| v 1 | 359 | iv 19 | 337 | iii 3 | 364 |
| v 1 sq. | 368 | v 27 | 339 | • ZEPHANIAH | |
| vii 14 | 369 | vii 31 | 403 | ii 5 sq. | 285 |
| vii 20 sqq. | 359 | xiv 9 | 342 | ii 14 | 323 |
| viii 40 | 375 | xix 5 | 403 | ZECHARIAH | |
| xviii | 310 n. | xxvii 11 sq. | 339 | xii 11 | 349 |
| xviii 8 | 311 | xxxi 15 | 390 | MALACHI | |
| xviii 16 | 334 | xxxi 23 | 398 | i 2 sq. | 339 |
| xviii 17 | 394 | xlvi 4 | 286 | i 11 | 342 |
| xxii 8 | 396 | l 7 | 398 | | |
| xxii 9 | 395 | | | | |
| xxviii 3 | 396 | | | | |
| xxix 23 | 394 | | | | |
| APOCRYPHA | | | | | |
| 1 MACCABEES | | JUBILEES | | | |
| vi 15 | 322 | xxxiv 20 | 359 | | |
| | | xliv 33 | 359 | | |
| NEW TESTAMENT | | | | | |
| HEBREWS | | | | | |
| vii 1 sqq. | 397 | | | | |

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY
W. LEWIS
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS